The Congregational Quarterly

Editor:
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Editorial Board:
REV. DOUGLAS HORTON, D.D.
REV. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D.
DR. WILL G. MOORE, M.A.
MR. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.
REV. LESLIE J. TIZARD, B.A., B.D., B.Litt.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY is published on the 20th of March, June, September, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the publishers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any bookseller at 2s. 6d.

All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at 35 Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Vol. XXIII. No. 2. **APRIL, 1945**

CONTENTS

(Continued from cover)

PAGE

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS—
CO-OPERATION IN MINISTERIAL TRAINING. By the DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S, Drs. C. H. DODD, E. O. JAMES, and T. W. MANSON - 150

ON LIFE AND BOOKS—
PICKED IN BY-PATH MEADOW - - - - ALBERT PEEL 158

CURRENT LITERATURE. By the EDITOR, Dr. SYDNEY CAVE, Principal J. MORGAN JONES, M.A., Dr. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL, the Rev. JOHN MARSH, M.A., Dr. ROBERT S. FRANKS - - - - - - - - 169

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST. By the EDITOR, Dr. G. F. NUTTALL, the Rev. JOHN MARSH, M.A., Dr. R. S. FRANKS, the Rev. A. T. S. JAMES, B.A., MSc., and Miss MARGARET PEEL, B.A. - - - 178

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS - - - - - - - - - - 191

CORRESPONDENCE—
DATE, PLEASE! By the Rev. L. M. WILLIAMS - - - - - 192

(Made and Printed in Great Britain.)

. . . . the Admiral and the Master joined us in the Lounge . . .

The Master told us of his terrible experience after being torpedoed and the great work done by the British Sailors' Society. We were so impressed and so grateful to the Society for their magnificent work we made a collection on the spot.

Nothing is too good for our brave sailors, who so often have to make the supreme sacrifice in order to bring our ships safely through. It is our duty to see that the Society, who are so qualified to give the right sort of help at the right time, do not lack the necessary funds to carry out their service to our sailors.

BRITISH SAILORS' SOCIETY

680 COMMERCIAL ROAD, LONDON, E.14

To the Hon. Treasurer,
The Right Honourable SIR FREDERICK SYKES, P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.B.E., K.C.B., C.M.G., M.P.

Please send further particulars .....

.....

I enclose £ : : , to help this good cause.

Name .....

Address .....

.....

Bankers, National Provincial Bank Ltd.

BSS 182

HAPPINESS— the Birthright of EVERY child!

Our first concern is to surround these unwanted little babes with parental love and care. By arranging for their adoption into happy Christian homes, these blessings are secured for the child and for the Adoptive Parents the joy of a little one in their home.

This Christlike work needs your prayers and practical help

HOMELESS CHILDREN'S AID and ADOPTION SOCIETY

and F. B. MEYER CHILDREN'S HOME (Incorp.)

Cheques and P.O.'s crossed Barclays Bank, Ltd.

Rev. J. Reynolds Jones (Hon. Treas.), 162, High Road, Wood Green, London, N.22

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. GERAINT V. JONES, M.A., B.Litt. Congregational Minister, Halifax.

The Rev. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D. Principal of the United College, Bradford.

Mr. G. ELLIOTT DODDS, M.A. Editor and Director, *Huddersfield Examiner*. Formerly President, National League of Young Liberals.

The Rev. RICHARD M. FAGLEY, M.A. Education Secretary of the Church Peace Union, New York. Editor of the World Alliance News Letter.

The Very Rev. W. R. MATTHEWS, K.C.V.O., D.D., D.Litt. Dean of St. Paul's.

The Rev. C. H. DODD, M.A., D.D. Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

The Rev. E. O. JAMES, M.A., D.Litt., D.D. Professor of the History and Philosophy of Religion, University of Leeds.

The Rev. T. W. MANSON, M.A., D.D., D.Litt. Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis, University of Manchester.

The Rev. ALAN G. KNOTT, B.Sc. Congregational Minister, Carrs Lane, Birmingham.

The Rev. J. MORGAN JONES, M.A. Principal of Bala-Bangor Independent College, Bangor.

Fairy-Godfathers Wanted!

Most children know that Fairy-Godmothers come with a magic wand and turn ordinary things into something very delightful. Why should not Godfathers have a turn? They can wave a magic *wand* and provide many things that children need.

The Royal Alexandra School has its reconstruction problem. It had its plans for new premises near Reigate in Surrey, in beautiful country, with plenty of playing fields and fresh air—but the war stopped that, and now there will be increased cost to face.

Amongst those who read this *Quarterly* there must be some who have been successful in business; who do not need to "build bigger barns" for themselves; but who would like to "build bonny bairns" for Britain. To them we appeal for financial help, so that we may house our large family without anxiety.

Will you pay for and name one of the houses? If you cannot do this yourself, will you pass this to someone you know who can do so?

THE ROYAL ALEXANDRA SCHOOL

(formerly the Alexandra Orphanage. Founded 1758 *for fatherless or motherless girls and boys from all parts of the country)*

President: H.R.H. THE DUCHESS OF KENT

Hon. Treasurer: JAMES V. RANK, Esq.

Secretary: FRED. J. ROBINSON, F.C.I.S.

Offices: 34/40 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON, E.C.4.

LARGE STOCKS OF RELIGIOUS BOOKS

FOYLES

FOR BOOKS

Stock of nearly 3 Million Volumes

Books Bought. Quick Postal Service

New and Secondhand Books on every Subject

119-125 Charing Cross Road, London, W.C.2

Telephone: Gerrard 5660 (16 lines) **Open 9-6 including Saturday**

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

It is 26th February. Germany is being attacked from all sides, and the Americans are in Manila. Far more progress, in East and West, has been made than anyone would have dared to prophesy three months ago. Such is the onslaught from the air that it seems impossible that German resistance can be prolonged, and it has been said that ten consecutive days of fair weather would be decisive. We hope those ten days will intervene between the writing and the reading of these words, for the sooner the slaughter ceases and the Allies meet in Berlin the better. Then all the wisdom of statesmen and churchmen will be needed to prevent the repetition of the mistakes of 1919 and subsequent years. There may be long underground warfare in Germany, though we are inclined to doubt this: without prospect of rescue from without resistance movements in Germany will lack that inspiration which has sustained the underground forces in Norway and Holland, France, Denmark, and Belgium. And it really looks as if attempts to divide Russia, the United States, and Britain will fail, though no doubt they will be continued as long as possible. If they and China can work together for a generation, there will be hope of a world without war.

* * *

The Prime Minister has returned from more journeyings, and the nation is conscious—and we hope will always be conscious—of what it owes to his indomitable courage. He shirks nothing in the way of inconvenience or of responsibility, and his resilience, endurance, and pertinacity have been one of the Empire's greatest assets. Nevertheless, we shall be glad if he decides to become candidate for that part of the Epping division where we do not reside, for while we should hate to vote against him, we can scarcely see ourselves breaking so far with the past as to vote for him! We hope, however, the dilemma will not be forced upon us, and that we shall be saved from it by the announcement that, once victory is won, Mr. Churchill has decided to give his remaining years to writing a history of the War. What a book that would be—and nobody could write it like the Prime Minister; nobody could speak with the same authority, or narrate the dramatic story in such fitting words. Then the end would indeed crown the work. How much better for that to happen than for Mr. Churchill to become a

Party leader, maybe head of a minority group in Parliament, his policy rejected at the polls.

But we fear that the Prime Minister will not heed this counsel, and that the love of the strife will have too much sway with him. Is it fanciful to see how astutely already he is dividing the opposition—some to support a Coalition, some to oppose it, Socialists, Liberals, Independents, Commonwealth—so as to assure a Conservative majority?

* * *

It was with great regret that we read of the cessation of Mr. Raymond Graham Swing's American commentaries to Britain, and we were glad to read the tribute the *Sunday Times* paid to him. Mr. Swing has been the best interpreter of America to Britain during the last decade, perhaps because he knew Britain as well as he knew America, and was therefore well aware of what most needed to be said. It would be difficult to imagine a commentator with a finer gift of summary, or with equal power of seizing on the salient points. Mr. Swing has never pulled his punches or compromised with the truth as he saw it. He is a firm believer in Anglo-American friendship, and in the need for wholehearted co-operation; he knows and has explained the difficulties in the way, and it has been good to hear the combination of courageous optimism and sound commonsense. Once when we were telling Mr. Swing how much his commentaries to Britain were appreciated, he remarked that he was glad to know it, for he got very few direct reactions. We hope the inarticulateness of the British people and their failure to express gratitude and appreciation have not been a contributory cause of the cessation of the broadcasts. We know we speak for many in expressing the hope that the silence is only temporary; a campaign to "Bring Swing back" might be a good thing; soon, we trust, the familiar "Good evening" will be heard by us again.

* * *

It is greatly to be regretted when advocates of a good cause raise doubts by their carelessness and by the extravagance of their language. For Messrs. Fenner Brockway and Frederic Mullally certainly have a good cause and make a good case in *Death Pays a Dividend* (Gollancz, 3s. 6d.). "Would" for "should" and *Revelations* perhaps should not deter the reader, but we expect writers on political subjects to know the correct office held by Cabinet ministers (p. 59). Is it correct to say that the British Government "relied chiefly" upon the bomber to maintain order in outlying parts of the Empire? Even when we agree, we feel the writers exaggerate: would it had been true that the Nye Report revealed

> to the public eye an organized conspiracy against peace which struck deep at the roots of contemporary complacency and

left an indelible imprint on the consciousness of an entire generation.

Few of the entire generation, we fear, regarded either the Nye Report or President Roosevelt's dictum that the "grave menace" of armaments to the peace of the world was

due in no small way to the uncontrolled activities of the manufacturers and merchants in engines of destruction.

Appalling examples are given of these "uncontrolled activities", whereby nations were embroiled, disarmament proposals sabotaged, and laws circumvented, and it is urged that the "Merchants of Death" can only be overcome by the nationalization of armaments, with an international court of arbitration, police force, supervisory authority, and economic board—and better still by the abolition of the competitive profit-making system.

Here are two of the quoted passages:

> The directors note with satisfaction that, on the breaking down of the Disarmament Conference, the Government has decided on increasing the Air Force to bring it more into line with other nations.
>
> . . . During the year under review we have delivered aircraft to four foreign Governments.
>
> . . . The future of the Empire demands an Air Force equal to that of any other. The disparity with the strength of other Powers is disturbing.
>
> Chairman, Handley Page Company, 1934.

> Huge German orders for rubber and copper were executed in London yesterday, regardless of cost. The buying of nearly 3,000 tons of copper sent the price rocketing up 18s. 9d. to £44 18s. 9d. a ton. Already Germany has bought over 10,000 tons this month in London alone.
>
> *News-Chronicle*, 19th August, 1939.

* * *

THE Bishop of Chelmsford recently committed himself to the statement, without any qualification at all, that

99.9 per cent of Christians would say you have in the Apostles' Creed a doctrine upon which all Christians are agreed from the Salvation Army to the Pope of Rome.

This leaves us absolutely staggered. Are 99.9 per cent of baptized members of the Church of England sufficiently articulate in their Christianity to express belief in the Apostles' Creed? Would 99.9 per cent of the Anglican clergy, of the episcopate even, agree with the Bishop, or are Modern Churchmen only .1 per cent of Anglicans? There are clauses in the Apostles' Creed which many Christians do not understand, much less accept. Indeed, we once heard one of the best *N.T.* scholars, and one of the most devout Christians, in the United States declare that there was only one affirmation in the Apostles' Creed which he could accept as it stood,

unreservedly and without explanation—"suffered under Pontius Pilate"! That, of course, is an extreme case, but there are scores of stages of opinion between it and the complete acceptance of the Creed as it stands. Some large denominations impose no creed, but in every denomination can be found those who wonder about "He descended into hell" and "born of the Virgin Mary". The Bishop may have issued some explanation ot his assertion; we hope so, for as it stands it certainly misleads "those that are without". And he would do well to note how a schoolmaster regards the claim that the Apostles' Creed represents the Christian faith—see Dr. P. T. Freeman's *Christianity and Boys*, reviewed within.

* * *

UNDER the title *When John Comes Marching Home* an American scholar has published a study of the problem presented by men returning from the wars. It is a problem which affects the Church of Christ in every land, and we are anxiously asking whether the churches show any sign of being able to capture these millions of men and women, a huge cross-section of that generation they had lost. We should do well to remember that when the "boys" come home they will judge the Church not by the pronouncements of the World Council of the Churches, episcopal utterances, or resolutions passed by the Congregational Union of England and Wales. Those of them who are ready to give the Church a chance will visit the church attended by their families or their girls, and will judge the Church by what they find there. Is the Vicar a man? Is the worship vital and relevant to life? Does the sermon spring from the preacher's own experience, and is there a sense of urgency and passion about it? Is the church a friendly church? Do its officers give the impression of willingness to adopt new methods to serve a new age? On the answer to such questions as these the future attitude of many a serving man and woman—and the future of many a church—will depend.

* * *

The healing of His seamless dress
Is by our beds of pain;
We touch Him in life's throng and press,
And we are whole again.

No, dear Congregational reader, you must not sing these words in your worship. Don't you know that they were written by a Quaker, and should have no place in a Congregational hymnbook? So say some of our pettipopes, if we may use a good sixteenth-century expression; and we are inclined to think that Congregationalists will quietly ignore them, as they ignore the utterances of all other Popes! Christians have always (and rightly) rejoiced in the catholicity of their hymnbooks, where for worship they use the

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL

words of men in all branches of Christ's Church, and so express His "wide-embracing, wondrous love". We are not going to reject "In the cross of Christ I glory" because Sir John Bowring was a Unitarian; and for as long as the English language is used and God's praise is sung Christians will together re-dedicate themselves in the words:

O Lord and Master of us all!
Whate'er our name or sign,
We own Thy sway, we hear Thy call,
We test our lives by Thine;

and it will not bother them at all that John Greenleaf Whittier was a Quaker.

* * *

MANY comparisons have been made between American and British preaching, and President A. L. Lowell's *Facts and Visions* (Harvard & Oxford Presses, 11s. 6d.) is an interesting study. For 24 years the graduating class at Harvard asked the President to preach the baccalaureate sermon—and here they are, from 1910 to 1933. This volume, then, is not ordinary American preaching, for the "baccalaureate" is a *genre* of its own—and only those who have attempted it know how difficult it is. Nevertheless, these sermons have definite American characteristics, the first of which is that they are not "sermons" at all, even though they start with a text. Addresses, yes, filled with wise counsel, telling of wisdom, service, responsibility, ideals, truth: addresses which would leave those who listened sobered and thoughtful. And the preacher knows his Bible, and can expound it. If preaching is "truth through personality", then this could be good preaching, but the reader does not "get" the personality. Did President Lowell believe in the Incarnation? In what sense did he believe that Jesus lives, or in the power of the Holy Spirit? The words of Jesus are sometimes quoted, and once at any rate His sacrifice is mentioned; but we do not know whether the President believed "God was in Christ reconciling men unto Himself", and how he thought that fact affected his own life and the lives of the graduating class. A careful analysis of these sermons might disclose that they were Christian, but there is little in them that the good theist could not say. Perhaps, however, this would be more typical of American preaching twenty years ago than it is today.

* * *

WE hope that the various denominations will be able to supply vitamins to the microscopic co-operation mouse the Federal Free Church Council mountain has brought forth. About the main subject there will be opportunity to speak when further consideration has been given to the Report, but there is one suggestion which becomes more urgent every day—that of Free Church publicity.

There is a type of publicity which in the churches is abhorrent, but another which is not only legitimate but in these days absolutely essential. One of the transformations wrought by Dr. Temple during his brief occupancy of the See of Canterbury was in this field. Never had the Church of England received more attention in the Press than from 1942 to 1944. This was due not merely to the Archbishop's personality, and the fact that when he spoke he had always something to say; it was due also to the trouble he took to supply the Press well in advance with speeches he desired to be reported. The leaders of the Free Churches are not reported because they have no machinery to send out such advance copy. Every person accustomed to make public addresses in the United States knows that if he wishes to be accurately reported he must help the Press by sending them summaries of what he intends to say; and we must learn to do it here.

Of course, the question of publicity concerns more than speeches. It concerns the radio, where nobody would claim that the view of the Free Churches is ever put adequately, to say nothing of stridently. It concerns the theatre and the cinema too. A Free Church playwright who could get on the stage the representation of that fight for civil and religious freedom our fathers found so stirring would be a gift from heaven. Plays now are clever enough, but the life they suggest is often appalling in its squalor: from some of the plays of today it might be deduced that there are no chaste, virtuous, responsible people left in certain sections of society.

And the cinema? All who have eyes to see—and ears to hear, for one has only to listen sufficiently to the radio—know that the Roman Catholic Church has been quick as ever to employ a new medium for propaganda. Sometimes the propaganda is not good, and the intelligent in any case are uninfluenced; but masses of the people seeing "Going My Way" get an idea of the priesthood which the Roman Catholic Church is well content that they should have. And what stories the Free Churches have to tell! When is Mr. J. Arthur Rank going to let the world see John Wesley on the screen in a film which will have the appeal of "Gone with the Wind"? And what a scenario the story of John Penry would make! Hanged at thirty, leaving four little girls, the eldest four years old, coming from the Welsh mountains to Cambridge and Oxford, with all the mystery of the secret Marprelate press, a youth of 24 bearding the Archbishop of Canterbury and the leaders of Church and State, hunted from pillar to post, escaping to Scotland and stealing back to take part in secret meetings for worship in London—what a story! About it we remember a discussion with one of the leading film producers in this country. He was impressed by the story, as well he might be. But he was Italian, and

he thought such a film might be "divisive". By all means let us have attractive priests and ritual with processions and colour: let men see the appeal the Roman Church can make to the eye on the screen: but the fight for freedom, the spread of truth, John Howard and Elizabeth Fry, William Carey and John Williams—these are taboo. Let the Free Churches, then, set to work on propaganda in every medium which will be a faithful proclaiming of the good news: it is more than time.

* * *

ONE day the Memorial Hall will be itself again—and may it be soon. The cooking, the stores, the smells, and the rats will have disappeared, and there will be glass in the windows once again. But while there is the chance, let reconstruction begin at home, and Congregationalism have a national home of which we need not be ashamed.

Let the Memorial Hall first become Congregational, the Memorial Hall Trust handing over its functions to the Union. It is often said that the Hall was put into the hands of individual Trustees because of suspicion of the power of the Union, but there seems little ground for the statement: the Trustees were much the same in personnel as the Union Committee, and it is probable that the explanation is that the Union was not then Incorporated and could not hold property. Then let the Union use the building to the full, with the tenants all Congregational, and paying an economic rent. Let the Library be resuscitated, with monthly book talks for ministers by scholars who are masters of their subjects. Let some of the cooking apparatus of the L.C.C. restaurant be retained, and let it be possible for Congregationalists to have a cup of coffee together, and even a Congregational chop or steak (O-o-oh!). But let us stop patching and mending, and make a real job of it. It would pay—in every way.

* * *

HISTORY is a cordial for drooping spirits, and when Christians are inclined to lament the weakness and the failure of the Church, it is well that they should remind themselves that there are evils from which the Church has to a large extent emancipated itself. Here are some words from Dr. A. J. Whyte's *The Evolution of Modern Italy*, relating to Naples:

> "If we divide all the families of the kingdom into sixty parts", wrote the economist Antonio Genovesi in 1765, "one of these owns land, the rest have not enough to be buried in. Half the soil of Naples is held by the Church, and may not be sold. . . ." For a population well under five millions the Church provided twenty-one Archbishops, 165 Bishops and Abbots, 50,000 Priests and more than the same number of monks and nuns. She drew an income from all sources esti-

> mated at not less than 12,000,000 ducats. The Church lived in ease and often luxury, amidst poverty and squalor unequalled in Europe. . . . On the condition of the peasantry the verdict of contemporaries is unanimous. Abject and utterly ignorant, living in hovels and caves, tied to the soil, without rights or defenders, they were like beasts of burden that cannot eat the food they carry on their backs.

Surely that cannot longer be said. Or can it? But, with all its divisions and its lack of faith and hope, the Church of Christ in England is assuredly not open to charges which could be levelled at it in the 18th century, exaggerated as some of them no doubt were.

* * *

We hope some enterprising publisher will see that Prof. H. Shelton Smith's *Faith and Nurture* is published on this side. In it will be found a summary of what constitutes liberalism, that much belaboured form of Christianity which is "dead, but it won't lie down". Its characteristic marks are:

(1) *Divine immanence:* God is "the indwelling reality of one organic and developing world-process".
(2) *Evolutionary development:* progress, without crises, to the Kingdom of God, within and without.
(3) *Belief in the goodness of man.*
(4) Emphasis on the *historical Jesus.*
(5) Belief in salvation as catching the spirit of *sacrificial love* from Jesus, and being transformed by it.
(6) Seeing the Kingdom of God as an ideal social order to be realized by improving social conditions, especially by extending democracy to economics.

* * *

There is too much truth in the words of a character in Miss Barbara Goolden's novel, *Call the Tune,* for members of the Christian Churches to read them without flinching:

> I happen to regard Christianity as a magnificent revolutionary power put to ignoble use by the priests and prelates. I've yet to meet the bishop who wasn't just a little too gentlemanly for the Founder of his Faith, and I've yet to come across the parson who'd gladly welcome to his church the riff-raff Christ sat down to meat with.

* * *

We often tantalize readers by asking them to affix dates to quotations. Here is one:

> The imperfection of the reforming work of the sixteenth century depends upon the doctrine of the Church not having been thoroughly gone into, or the ecclesiastical question definitely settled, when all other questions were so. This is the very point that the Reformers, who could not do or see every-

thing, have left to our care. No doubt a Church, where much is said about the Church, is not *for that reason* more vigorous or healthy; but a Church which does not realize the idea of Church, or care about realizing it, which does not even feel the need to do so, is not the most desirable Church either. Men did not separate for the sake of separating; separation was but a *medicine* that many have mistaken for *food*.

Vinet's *Outlines of Theology* (1866), a poor translation.

* * *

A PROPHECY that went wrong:

> Less than a century ago Daniel Webster thanked God that the Great Stony Mountains would ever be an impenetrable barrier between the East and California.

With characteristic eloquence he asked the Senate:

> What do we want of that vast and worthless area—that region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts, of shifting sands and whirling winds, of dust, of cactus, of prairie dogs? To what use could we even put those endless mountain ranges? What could one do with the western coast of three thousand miles, rockbound, cheerless, and uninviting?

* * *

> "I found the Congregational people appreciative listeners, and above being deterred from church-going by inclement weather".

YES, but this was when Dr. Daniel Evans was visiting England in 1910! Is it true in 1945? And in a climate which made the doughboy ask incredulously, "But do people live here in peace-time?"

Many are the stories told about ("on", as they would say) our American guests; they themselves enjoy the reported conversation between the GI and the Tommy inspecting a stream-lined engine at Euston:

> "I wonder what we'd do with a thing like that back home?"
>
> "I know: one of three things".
>
> "Yeah?"
>
> "Lean against it—chew it—or cuddle it".

In Glasgow they tell of the American soldier's reply to the reminder that he ought not to leave Scotland without visiting the Livingstone Memorial at Blantyre: "Isn't that the guy that Stanley found?" Why is it, by the way, that the Americans prefer Scotland and its people to the south of the Tweed and those who dwell there. Time and again in recent months we have heard this preference vociferously proclaimed. What is the explanation?

* * *

THE resurrection of an old story did not prevent the re-election of President Roosevelt. Mrs. Roosevelt is supposed to have been in

the room when her husband made diametrically opposite statements to two callers.

Mrs. R.: Franklin, how can you do it? You told Jim he was perfectly right, and then you told Joe he was perfectly right, and you know they take exactly opposite views. You mustn't do such things.

The President: Eleanor, you're perfectly right.

* * *

OUTSIDE a Glasgow church is this notice:

If absence makes the heart grow fonder, there must be a lot of people in this district who dearly love their church.

* * *

A CORRESPONDENT assures us that this notice appeared in company orders in a Yorkshire town:

Church Parade.

Roman Catholics will parade at 09.45 hours; Church of England at 10.00 hours; other demons at 10.15 hours.

* * *

READERS will be interested to know that 69,323 members were received into the Congregational churches of the United States last year, a net increase of 15,539, giving a total membership of 1,093,325. Last autumn these churches had sent 392 chaplains into the Services, 290 to the Army, and 102 to the Navy. That number will now be increased, for the Navy asked the denomination to furnish 36 more chaplains in January. Congregationalism in the United States, and therefore the world over, owes much to Dr. F. L. Fagley, Dr. Douglas Horton's colleague, who has had charge of the chaplaincy department of the denomination's work. He is the father of the Rev. Richard M. Fagley, who contributes to the present issue.

* * *

OUR profit in 1944 was a matter of shillings, but still it was a profit! Thank you to everybody, but especially to those loyal readers who for twenty-three years have given the journal magnificent support.

* * *

READERS of these pages may frequently find themselves indebted to Mr. R. L. Hine, for the Hitchin historian's stories are often up to our standard! We like the one of the London old maid, who complained to the G.P.O. of the shocking language used by men repairing telegraph wires; the foreman, asked to send in a report, wrote: "Me and Bill Fairweather were on this job. I was up the telephone pole, and accidentally let the hot lead fall on Bill. It went down his neck, and he looked up and said, 'You really must be more careful, Harry' ".

THE ENGLISH AS OTHERS SEE THEM

By Geraint Vaughan Jones, M.A., B.Litt.

I. Mr. Hamilton Fyfe wrote a book called *The Illusion of National Character* to show that there is no such thing as National Character. Sir Ernest Barker, on the other hand, wrote a book, a far better book, proving that there is such a thing as National Character; and Dr. Thomas Jones, formerly Secretary to the Cabinet, has offered an analysis of Welsh character, as it is usually conceived, which could be aptly illustrated by a description of the ancient Greeks taken from Thucydides and other sources; yet he admits[1] that Welsh character has its own distinctive traits. Further, anyone who has travelled at all widely knows that there is a great difference between the North and the South in every nation: that the North Welshman differs from the South Welshman, the Yorkshireman from the Cockney, the Normandy peasant from the peasant of the Midi, the North German from the Bavarian, and so on; he knows that the Northern Italian is less temperamental than the Provençal Frenchman, and the Spaniard of Galicia than his brother (or uncle) in Andalusia. Yet when this has been said, it remains a fact of experience that the Germans, the French, the Spaniards, the Italians, the English, even the Welsh, have certain marked characteristics which can be defined, and which endure throughout the centuries. The speech with which Ethelbert received Augustine when the latter landed on the coast of Kent in A.D. 597 can still be cited as an illustrative proof of the conservatism and tolerance of the English character:

> Your words are fair, but because they are new and doubtful I cannot give my assent to them, and leave the customs which I have so long observed, with the whole Anglo-Saxon race. But because you have come hither as strangers from a long distance and as I myself seem to have seen clearly, that what you yourselves believe to be true and good you wish to impart to us, we do not wish to molest you; nay, rather, we are anxious to receive you hospitably, and to give you all that is needed for your support, nor do we hinder you from joining all whom you can to your faith.

On the whole the English attitude of mind has not greatly changed since then. Tolerance may have to some extent changed to indifference, and respect for tradition to something more static and less inspired; but tolerant and cautious the English still are. If it be objected that what is regarded as "English" is the outlook

[1] *Leeks and Daffodils*, 186 ff.

characteristic of the dominant class, that is partly true; though it is not as true as some foreign observers (and Mr. Hamilton Fyfe) would have us believe. Chaucer, Milton, Cromwell, *Punch,* Fielding, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Winston Churchill, are all in the same definable tradition; and if it is objected that they are all members of the middle class (with the possible exception of the Prime Minister), then the obvious answer is that that which is characteristically English comes to its most typical expression in the middle class.

Foreign observers have examined the English rather in the same way as the English examine the animals from overseas which are kept for their delectation in the cages of the Zoo. True: the English can be regarded as a type to themselves, as an interesting sub-division of the *genus homo,* and it is perhaps by approaching them from this zoological standpoint that their vices and their virtues can be best understood and appreciated. There is nothing unfair in this method of approach, for the Englishman in Wales is often inclined to treat the Welsh as inhabitants of a quaint and curious Reserve for Natives. From this standpoint one of the acutest anatomizers of the English, H. W. Nevinson, has described his countrymen in *Rough Islanders;* the foreigner can at least be forgiven if he, too, tries to understand and describe their customs and habits in the manner of a zoologist examining a strange animal in its habitat. The Englishman is, of course, no longer as insular as he used to be; yet one cannot but feel that Dr. Johnson's famous judgment has much truth in it:

> Two men of any other nation who are thrown into a room together, at a house where they are both visitors, will immediately find some conversation. But two Englishmen will probably go each to a different window, and remain in obstinate silence.

This may be what two Englishmen from, say, Golders Green or one of our Public Schools as they are popularly imagined to be, might do; but it is not true of natives of Oldham, Heckmondwike, or the Old Kent Road. Heine, too, has often observed this kind of Englishman, though he has to confess that he has noticed some change for the better even in the stiff and formal natives of these islands; they have developed, however, not because of any inherent law of evolution, but through contact with the continental world.

> Stiff, silent Englishmen pilgrimage in crowds to France in order to learn how to talk and move themselves, and when they return you notice with amazement that their tongues have become loosened, that they no longer behave as though they are lefthanded in both hands, and they are no longer satisfied

> with beef steak and plum pudding. I have actually seen such an Englishman, who asked for sugar with his cauliflower; a most heretical attitude towards the severe English cookery, which made the waiter nearly fall backwards; for surely since the Roman invasion nobody had ever imagined that cauliflower should be cooked otherwise than in water and consumed without any sweet addition.

Travellers since Heine have shared his opinions; chiefly because they have not crossed the line which runs horizontally through Oxford; when they have done so, they have discovered another England.

II. Foreign literature about England is considerable; I must therefore make some typical selections from the writings of shrewd and practised observers of the English Reserve, separated by its large moat from the rest of Europe.

One of the most distinguished travellers who visited England in the eighteenth century was the famous Italian dramatist, Count Vittorio Alfieri. In his *Autobiography* (*La Vita*), completed in Florence in 1803, he describes his journeys in considerable detail—journeys which led him as far afield as Finland, Russia, Germany, the Low Countries, France, and four times to England. His first visit to England in 1768 impressed him greatly. One of the things which struck him most forcibly was "the difference between England and the other continental countries in the wide distribution of public happiness deriving from its superior mode of government". Although he did not make a serious study of the British Constitution he records the opinion that the wellbeing of the country and of the population as a whole was evidence of its excellence and of its "divine effects" (*gli effetti divini*). Alfieri went from London to Portsmouth, returning *via* Bath, Bristol, Salisbury, and Oxford. The climate he found unpleasant, as we do today; but in spite of this he was impressed "above all by the fair government and true liberty which is its daughter" (*sopra tutto l'equitativo governo, e la vera libertà che n'è figlia*). If we wish to appreciate to the full Alfieri's impressions of England and the English, we should compare them with his reactions to the Berlin of Frederick the Great, which he visited in the following year. Prussia seemed to him to be a "universal barracks" which he abhorred. He thoroughly disliked Frederick, and, on presenting himself at Frederick's Court in civilian dress, was rebuked by Count Finck, who asked him why he had not put on his uniform. To which Alfieri replied that there were enough uniforms in that Court without his. It need scarcely be said that the differences which Alfieri noted between Prussia and England in the eighteenth century were precisely the same as those which he would have noticed in 1914 or 1939.

Another eighteenth-century visitor from the Continent who left on record his impressions of England was Goethe's friend, Karl Philipp Moritz (1757-93), who published a diary of his journeys under the title of *A German's Travels in England in the Year 1782* (*Reisen eines Deutschen in England im Jahre 1782*). Moritz seems to have been interested chiefly in what he saw and did, for his description of externalities occupies more space than observations on English character and habits. His journal resembles Dorothy Wordsworth's *Journal of a Tour on the Continent in 1820* in that it provides the reader with an account of movement from place to place and various anecdotes. What impressed Moritz, on landing at Dover and proceeding by coach to London, was the huge and restless crowds; for the main road from Greenwich to London "was already far busier than the most crowded street in Berlin, so great was the number of people on horseback and riding in coaches and walking". Moritz was struck, too, by the large number of people whom he saw wearing spectacles. The Thames seemed to be as busy as the busiest of the London streets, and the view from Westminster Bridge, he assures us, was splendid. The Londoners were very kind to him and some of them went to considerable trouble to find him lodgings.

> It was for me a curious yet wonderful feeling to be for the first time among none but English people, among people who spoke a foreign tongue, who had strange customs and a strange climate, and yet among whom I could move about and to whom I could talk, as though I had been brought up with them since childhood.

Three weeks after his arrival, Moritz arrived in Oxford at night, which displeased him because he was not able to see from a distance the towers of the churches and colleges of which he had heard so much. His companion suggested that they might go to a *Bierhaus*, where there would be company. The *Bierhaus* turned out to be the famous Mitre Hotel, where he witnessed a curious argument among some clergymen and dons as to whether God was a drinker of wine, which, according to a Mr. Modd, subsequently chaplain to Corpus Christi, could not be proved by the Scriptures. After a noisy night the company broke up, Mr. Modd remarking, "Damn me, I must read prayers in All Souls College!" Moritz found the service at the Mitre first-rate, as doubtless many others have done before and since; but in order to make quite sure of proper attention he told the waiter not to imagine that he (Moritz) was going to give him a small tip just because he had arrived on foot. In fact, he would do the opposite, "which procured me the best attention which the world could offer".

Unlike many modern German visitors to England, Moritz saw

a good deal of the country and its people outside London, travelling at least as far north as Leicester.

The great Goethe did not travel to England. It is a pity that he spent so little time out of his own country, for the observations of the greatest man of letters of the time on the life of other Europeans would have been of permanent interest. He was, however, familiar with English literature, and was frequently visited by Englishmen, such as Carlyle, when they went to Germany. It is interesting to note that Goethe shared a widely-held view of the English, one which has often led to the criticism that the English are hypocrites, namely, that when they do things for ostensibly humane and idealistic reasons they are really acting from self-interest; at best, they are clever enough to act in such a way that their sincerely held ideals coincide with practical self-interest. In 1829 he remarked to Eckermann:

> Whereas the Germans torture themselves with the solution of philosophical problems the English laugh at us, with that great practical common-sense of theirs, and conquer the world. Everyone is familiar with their declamations against the slave trade, and while they try to inform us about the humane principles which underlie such agitation, the real motive is revealed as a matter of definite policy, without which it is known that the English never act, and which one should have known.

Goethe tells Eckermann that it is in the interest of the English to abolish the slave trade because so much black labour is used in the West African colonies, and that the export of slaves to America would result in a labour shortage in British territory and such an abundance of it in America that the Americans would be able to undercut the English. Elsewhere in the *Conversations* Eckermann reports Goethe as expressing himself in similar terms on the English. The German weakness, he said, was too much theory; if the Germans could take a leaf out of the Englishman's book and become less philosophical and more practical, it would do more for the German people than the Second Coming of Christ. "All Englishmen", he said in 1825, "are without real capacity for reflective thinking . . . but they are great as practical men". (Incidentally, Goethe's judgment on his own people is illuminating: "A few more centuries may pass before it can be said about the Germans that it is a long time since they were barbarians".—To Eckermann, 3 May, 1827.)

While Goethe was enjoying the peace of old age in Weimar and passing imperishable judgments on men and letters and history, his younger contemporary Heine was visiting this country. In his Preface to *Englische Fragmente* Heine refers to a book by one Franckh, of Munich, entitled *Letters of a Dead Man: a Diary of*

journeys in England, Wales, Ireland, and France, written in 1828 and 1829. This, he says, is the best book he knows on England and the English, though others have appeared. Heine, however, is not so much concerned with things seen, as what the Englishman is like, and with great skill he singles out the salient characteristics of English life and character. The English are a homely people; their life is a limited family life, and they are content with such freedom as assures them of their personal rights, physical freedom, their religious beliefs, and their personal whims. Nobody is freer at home than the Englishman; he is both king and bishop in his own home: it is his castle. The Germans, on the contrary, trouble little about either freedom or equality; they are a speculative people, ideologues, philosophers, and dreamers, living in the past and the future but not in the present:

> The Englishman loves freedom as his lawful wife; he possesses her, and even if he does not always treat her gently, he knows how to protect her in a case of necessity, and woe betide the red-coated fellow who violates the sanctity of her bedroom, be he gallant or policeman.

The German, on the contrary, "loves freedom as he loves his old grandmother". Heine was greatly impressed with London, by its riches and by its teeming poverty; by the monotony of its residential streets, and the single dwelling-houses which reflected the exclusiveness of the English temperament. In spite of the great contrasts in ways of living, in wealth and poverty, Heine perceived in the English a fundamental unity which, in his opinion, was impossible in any other country:

> In spite of so many contrasted methods of living and thinking you nevertheless find in the English people a unity of outlook which consists of its feeling as one people. The newer cavaliers and roundheads may hate and despise each other, but they do not cease to be Englishmen; as such they are one and are organically related, like flowers which flourish in the same soil and are inseparably rooted in it. Hence the secret understanding between groups throughout the whole of English life: a phenomenon which at first sight would only plunge us into utter amazement. Wealth and poverty, orthodoxy and unbelief, freedom and serfdom, cruelty and kindness, honour and quackery: all these antitheses in all their absurd extremes, and in addition the grey misty sky, the humming machines which are audible on all sides, gaslights, chimneys, newspapers, mouths shut tightly—all these things fit so well into the picture that we cannot think of one without the other, and things which when looked at individually would fill us with astonishment and provoke us into mirth appear to us in the aggregate as quite unusual and even to be taken seriously in their wider context.

A century later Prof. Macneile Dixon, in his book *The Englishman,* passed the same judgment in almost identical words. A people does not change in fundamentals.

To the same period belong the observations of the famous Danish churchman and patriot, Bishop Nicolai Gruntvig (1783-1872), the founder of modern Denmark, a great educator, and the author of fourteen hundred hymns. He visited England in 1829, 1830, 1831, and 1843. Like other foreign observers he recorded his opinions about the practical character of the English, a feature which did not appeal to him very greatly. In 1812 he had written:

> Great Britain seems to belong to the lost lands. . . . The spiritual death is to be seen most plainly from the fact that the most distinguished intellects occupy themselves with mechanics, for here the body has entirely swallowed up the spirit, and seems to move quite independently of it.

He had a strong suspicion that there was a good deal of desperation at the bottom of the feverish activity of the English; they seemed to get little enjoyment from their work. He was impressed by the huge mechanical inventions which he saw at Birmingham and Newcastle, but was repelled by a system which made of men "mere accessories, mere appendages to machines". What he chiefly admired was the "free and living activity, the masterly grasp of the useful, the clear vision for what is really and lastingly creditable". A well-run English factory was such an efficient enterprise that he compared a political oligarchy to it. He hoped, however, that the English would learn to correct their mistake in subordinating men to machines. The fatal weakness which afflicted England was that

> the people are severed from their land, which has fallen into the hands of a flock of landlords who can neither possess it with right nor defend it when need arises; poverty will grow continually and bring the people to despair.

England was not a democracy but a plutocratic oligarchy which had sacrificed her peasants to industry. This was a mistake which Gruntvig was determined to hold before the Danes so that they might avoid it. There is much in Gruntvig's humane criticism of England that we can admire; the Industrial Revolution was an ugly affair, and it must have given the Dane, a practical visionary, a poor impression of the richest country in the world.

III. The Germans have been exceptionally industrious in offering their analyses of English character, as they have been in many other things. The best comprehensive book about England ever written is Wilhelm Dibelius's *England,* published in Germany in the nineteen twenties. It is written from a very German, but nevertheless not unsympathetic, standpoint, and should not be

ignored by anyone who wishes to see how the Englishman's actions and his institutions appear to an intelligent foreigner. Distinguished journalists, such as Dr. Karl Silex, Dr. von Stutterheim (of the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*), and Rudolf Kircher, editor of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, have through their books* given us admirable accounts of English life and personalities, Kircher's studies being exceptionally wide and understanding. Journalists have ample opportunity for observing the life of the people, yet of these able and distinguished writers, Silex and Stutterheim have based their conclusions about England on their knowledge and experience of only a small section of it: London and the South. As a picture of the Midlands or the North, Silex's entertaining *John Bull at Home* would be unrecognizable. There are two Englands, and one of them usually eludes the foreigner. What, then, are English qualities which, in addition to those already mentioned, impress the foreigner as being peculiarly English? To begin with Dibelius, the dominating ideal among the English is that of the gentleman.

> Distinctly and more strongly than with any other people, the traces of this old knightly ideal live on in England. . . . Throughout, indeed, this chivalrous spirit in the nation acts as an effective counterpoise to the notorious flightiness of modern democracy. The knightly notion of honour still persists, likewise quite generally. . . . Nowhere does woman enjoy so much respect as in the anglosaxon lands. . . . Another characteristic of the knightly idea is the inviolable force of the code, and ethics, and the forms of the social order, and this, too, is characteristic of the modern English gentleman. Every Englishman recognises church, state, and society, and conforms to their customs, however much he may doubt them in his heart; opposition is bad manners, and a sin against the spirit of the knight. It is "not done". . . . The religious atmosphere in which the rising middle classes were living contributed little or nothing to the modification of the knightly ideal. Under Puritanism the knightly canons of honour and truthfulness were carried over into the domain of commerce and industry, where they created the notion of fairness and set the world a brilliant example.

This "gentleman ideal", however, in Dibelius's opinion, never quite coincided with the teachings of Christianity, for Christ, being

* Karl Silex, *John Bull at Home;* Karl von Stutterheim, *The Press in England, Those English!;* Rudolf Kircher, *Pillars and Powers.* While we are on the subject of what Germans say about the English, it might be instructive to read what they say about themselves. I therefore recommend the following books to the interested reader: K. von Stutterheim, *The Two Germanies;* Eugen Diesel, *Germany and the Germans;* Rudolf Olden, *Is Germany a Hopeless Case?;* Sebastian Haffner, *Germany —Jekyll and Hyde;* Ernst Preuss, *The Canker of Germany;* F. W. Foerster, *Europe and the German Problem.* The last-named is very important and should be read by all who disapprove of Lord Vansittart's views about the Germans. A knowledge of Germans' ideas about themselves illuminates their interpretation of English character.

a tradesman, was never quite a gentleman. "Among the things every Englishman is proud of is the fact that the idea of the gentleman is peculiar to England". While we are on this pleasant subject of the Gentleman we may as well listen to what others have to say about it. Thus Hermann Kantorowicz, who was Professor of Law at Kiel until expelled by the Nazis, and whose brilliant book *The Spirit of British Policy* every Englishman should read, sympathetically writes:

> The ideal of the gentleman has had a most profound influence upon all classes of the English people, and consequently it has not been confined to its original sphere, to the more distinguished sections of society.

The Prussian officer ideal is the only thing corresponding to it in Germany, but to the masses this is something alien, whereas "in England everybody would be a gentleman".[2]

Dr. G. J. Renier, a Dutchman, does not take this "gentleman ideal" at all seriously; in his amusing and somewhat deadly book, *The English: Are they Human?*, he doubts whether it goes back any further than Arnold of Rugby, who was mainly responsible for the "gentleman ideal" in its peculiarly English form. It is a form of ritual, thrown off only in the country and in the pub, where the human Englishman, free from the stiff restraints imposed by this ideal, is finally unearthed.

A second salient feature of the English character, according to Dibelius, is individualism. The Englishman

> will submit to no order save that of his own creation, and is at all times prone to revolt against compulsion, whether governmental, military, or sacerdotal. . . . Social feelings, when they appear, take the form not so much of respect for the community, as of respect for the individuality of others.

Hence the Englishman's interest in biography, "since it enables him to establish a sort of personal relationship with great men". The Englishman is practical, not speculative. This idea is widespread among the non-English. Hence the pragmatic character of English philosophy, which, unlike that of the Germans and the French, is concerned less with metaphysics than with psychology. Political economy and the utilitarian philosophy are typical products of the English mind. The Englishman is genuinely humanitarian (even Bismarck, in a letter to the German Ambassador in London in 1870, said that the English "allow themselves to be swayed inordinately by vague humanitarian ideas of the kind which

[2] If the reader wishes to have more precise information about what a gentleman is I refer him to Prof. Macneile Dixon and Cardinal Newman. Prof. Dixon also believes that "everyone" in England desires to be thought a gentleman. Kantorowicz is an Anglophil, and has done a great service in publishing the truth about the often misrepresented concentration-camps set up during the Boer War.

dominates public opinion", and despised them for doing so); yet his humaneness is not easily to be separated from ethical self-righteousness, on the one hand, and practical cunning, on the other. Dibelius shares Goethe's opinion: humanitarianism with the English is often a cunning disguise for a ruthless policy. The great English vice, therefore, is cant,

> the masking of selfish motives by some other motive which exists and is not hypocritical, but which is not the decisive motive.

Still, Dibelius defends the English against unfair continental criticism. The ethical motives which inspired the fight against slavery, the protest against Turkish atrocities, the fight for freedom of trade, *etc.*, are genuine, even though they may be mixed up with other things.

Dishonesty comes in, however, when English statesmen, instead of candidly justifying their actions on the basis of the interests of the nation, invariably clothe them in the garb of humane abstract idealism.

Yet the Englishman does love truth. Kantorowicz is prepared to give the Englishman the benefit of the doubt, and insists that humanitarianism in national and international affairs is one of the major characteristics of British policy and character.

Another contemporary German, Dr. Hans Grimm, author of the famous novel *Volk ohne Raum* (*People without Space*), has voiced his opinions of the English in a lecture delivered in England in 1938 and published in Germany[3]. He lived for two years in England, and knew the English from a long residence in the Colonies. His respect for England and his understanding of the English are sincere and profound. The British Empire is for him an object of admiration, and he takes a sensible view of England's exercise of power. England, he says, has always succeeded in turning hatred into liking and compulsion into consent.

> It is not true that this liking for England, or acquiescence in the British Empire, has been deliberately induced. It is a manifestation unprovoked and uncommanded. It has appeared because British rule has proved itself good and unharrying, and because the English instinct for justice has brought with it greater personal security before the law than had ever before been imagined, and because the English master, who carved out his path so brutally, has developed a remarkable delicacy for the soul and individuality of every man with whom he has come into contact as a master.

Dr. Grimm is glad that it is the English, and not the Latins or the Slavs, who have imposed moral leadership on the world. How far this picture is true or false I am not prepared to discuss; the signifi-

[3] *Englische Rede: der Engländer wie ich ihn sehe*, Gütersloh, 1938.

cant thing is that it is a German who has presented it to us. The English, too, are free from envy. They have not had to suffer much internal dissension, nor has there been any of "the resentment of talented persons who could never find an opportunity for exercising their talents". This lack of envy is certainly a source of envy to the German; for *Schadenfreude,* joy in the misfortunes of others, and self-pity, two of the main symptoms of German national psychopathy, are closely related to envy. This absence of envy, according to Grimm, is an accompaniment of the "gentleman ideal":

> Among the whole people gentlemanliness has always had more influence than mobbishness, and among the whole people the gentleman has continued to be prized as an example.

One feature of English character which remains unintelligible to Dr. Grimm is lack of appreciation today of the creative type of man and the inability to see the need to protect this creative type. The problem for the present age (as Ortega y Gasset realized when he wrote *The Revolt of the Masses*) is the maintenance of quality in an age of masses, the struggle between *Hochwertigkeit* and *Vermassung*. In raising animals the English agree that the breed must be preserved; but they seem to be less interested in producing and preserving the qualitative life; for the mass, Dr. Grimm believes, and his belief is based on observation, has lost the finer features which distinguish the English from any other national character. A race must not be allowed to deteriorate into a state of "draggle-tailed proletarianization".

I have omitted to quote from the writings of the Anglophobes, of which there is a fair number, and have confined my citations to responsible and trained observers of English life; I believe that in most of what they have written there is much truth.

And members of other nations? It would be instructive to know more about what the French think of their neighbours across the Channel. M. André Maurois, unhappily, brilliant student of English letters though he is, and the creator of the inimitable Colonel Bramble, sheds little light on the character of the average Englishman, though in the advice which he offers to A Young Frenchman Leaving For England he gives some indication of what he thinks of a certain type of Englishman—the upper-middle-class-public-school type which does not seem to have to work for its living. The strong, silent Englishman is there, all complete, dressed to the last stud.

> A golden rule: never ask questions. I have lived for six months in the same tent as an Englishman; we shared a bath; but he never asked me whether I was married, or what I did in peacetime, or what were the books I read.

The Englishman, again, is anti-intellectual:

> Do not imagine that your intellectual worth gives you any prestige in their eyes (except amongst a very small set in London and at the Universities). Only one thing counts—your character. I doubt whether you could even imagine the contempt in which all literary culture is held by a certain type of Englishman. . . . Cultivated Englishmen are few, but their culture is exquisite, their epigrams are swift and subtle, their taste exacting and perfect. . . . To induce them to do something new, show them that they have always been doing it.

In a holiday diary kept in 1928 Maurois describes a Colonel whom he knows:

> He is a cultivated man in the English way: that is to say, he knows some history, the names of plants and birds, something about gardening, a smattering of architecture.

Dibelius, we have seen, considers individualism to be one of the leading features of English character. Maurois, at least where political behaviour is concerned, takes the opposite view. In an essay comparing political stability in France and England he attributes one of the failures of the French parliamentary system to the selfish individualism of the French politician, who differs from his English counterpart in not regarding himself as a member of a team. For the Frenchman parliament is a means of furthering his own aims, and he regards breaking, rather than making, governments as the chief object of the parliamentary sport. A Premier "is so fully occupied with self-protection against his successors that he has no time to rule". Contrasting the English and French politician Maurois writes:

> The English politician as a man is very like the French politician. Like the latter he is mean, generous, ambitious, jealous, admirable, and detestable. But as the rules of the game are different, the Englishman is led to shape his political career within a team, the Frenchman to blow up the party.

This certainly throws light on the failure of French political democracy.

As the French are (or were) reputed to be among the best cooks it would be pleasant to know more of what a man of the æsthetic refinement and exquisite taste of Maurois has to say about the way the English do their cooking. He agrees that English cooking is not as good as French, but seems to think that it is not as bad as it is said to be. Breakfast and tea are the best meals; luncheon is middling, dinner bad.

> At luncheon eat from the great joint of underdone beef, or some of the admirable pink ham. Pass over the dessert with a masculine air. Say firmly: I don't care for sweets. In England every other shop is a sweet-shop, and yet the English

> are contemptuous of sweets. Leave them to the women and children.

Are the English so contemptuous of sweets? Well, they may be; it is doubtful. It is a pity Maurois did not move in circles where dinner at night is not the rule but where high tea or supper is taken. Despite his familiarity with many aspects of English life, Maurois shows little knowledge of the man in the street.

IV. What of the small nations? How do they regard the Englishman at home? There are so many small nations that we cannot listen to what they all have to say; so let us, for example, try the Czechs, once unhappily described as a far away people about whom we know little. They, however, may know something about the English. And if Jaroslav Hasek, Karel Čapek, and Hofmeister are typical modern Czech writers, Czech descriptions of the English should be rather humorous.

Čapek's certainly are. In his delightful *Letters From England* he has left on record the manner in which this strange people impressed a Central European. It is true that we shall be disappointed if we hope to find a profound analysis of the psychology of the English, but that is not what Čapek sets out to provide. Many things impressed him as curious; the Cathedrals, for example, for

> nearly all English cathedrals have pillars in the form of water-pipes, a horrible organ in the middle of the chief nave, and fan-like ribs on the vaulting.

London streets he does not like; they are simply channels for traffic: people do not live in them and on them as they do abroad. They are

> just a gully through which life flows to get home. In the streets people do not live, stare, talk, stand or sit; they merely rush through the streets. Here the street is not the most interesting of places, where a thousandfold spectacle meets your gaze, and where a thousand adventures address themselves to you; a place where people whistle or scuffle, bawl, flirt, rest, poetize or philosophize, and enjoy life and indulge in jokes in twos, in threes, in families, in throngs, or in revolutions.

In his own country the street is a sort of large tavern or public garden,

> an extension of the home and doorstep; here it is something which belongs to nobody, and which does not bring anyone closer to his fellows; here you do not meet with people, and things; you merely avoid them.

The London clubs he found to be amusing institutions, expressing one aspect at any rate of the life of the English. The East End appalled him. The country he liked because it was like a garden. Oxford and Cambridge, too, were worth seeing. As for the most beautiful things in England, they are

> the trees, the herds, and the people; and, too, the ships. But old England comprises those rosy old gentlemen who in the spring-time wear grey top-hats and in the summer chase tiny balls over golf-courses, and they look so fresh and nice that I should like to play with them if I were eight years old; and the old ladies who always have some knitting in their hands and are rosy, nice-looking and kind, drink hot water and never tell you about their ailments. . . . On the whole, a country which has contrived to produce the finest childhood and the finest old age certainly possesses something of the best there is in this vale of tears.

"Every Englishman" does not wear loud check suits; but "every Englishman" wears a mackintosh and a cap, and "only the English lawn and the English gentleman are shaved every day".

Čapek finds the English gentleman difficult to define. He may be a waiter, a booking-clerk, or a policeman. The man opposite you in the train may be irritatingly silent throughout the journey, but if you cannot reach your bag from the rack he will suddenly and silently do it for you.

> Here the people always manage to help each other, but they never have anything to say to each other, except about the weather. That is probably why Englishmen have invented all games, and why they do not speak during their games.

On the whole the English are a taciturn people, rather forbidding, but when known more closely they are very kind and gentle.

> They enjoy themselves like children, but with the most solemn leathery expression; they have lots of ingrained etiquette, but at the same time they are as free and easy as young whelps. They are as hard as flint, incapable of adapting themselves, conservative, loyal, rather shallow, and always incommunicative.

Their Sunday is a horrible affair. It is the day when "nobody cooks, nobody travels, nobody gazes, and nobody thinks". English cooking is of two kinds: good and average. But the good cooking is always French cooking.

> Nobody can beam and warble while chewing pressed beef smeared with diabolical mustard. Nobody can exult aloud while ungluing from his teeth a quivering tapioca pudding.

On the whole the English lack *joie de vivre,* like their cooking, and the voluptuousness which characterizes continental life. Even English lovers carry on their love-making morosely and silently. . . . Yes, Čapek thinks the English are a likeable but peculiar people. And that, too, is the opinion of two Czech N.C.O.s who communicated their thoughts about the English to the *Manchester Guardian.* They are puzzled by the size of English newspapers, the monosyllabic answers "Yes" or "Quite". They have noticed

that the English love animals, and that the animals, cat, horse, or dog, return the confidence placed in them; that the English are kinder to them than continental people.

> We like (they write) the English breakfast, kindliness, detective stories, tolerance, smoking in cinemas, and walking across lawns in parks, hospitality, freedom of thought, whisky, girls in slacks, English humour, the courage of people in air-raids, fire-places (to look at), Scotland.

Among the things they dislike (and those of us who know countries other than England may share their dislikes) are English coffee, hospitals maintained by charity, the English Sunday, fire-places as a method of heating, absence of hooks (for clothes) in trains. However, they like the English, and admit that they have been largely conquered by the quiet charm of English life.

V. Lastly a word from Wales. In a copy of the *Welsh Nationalist* I saw a cartoon. John Bull says to (shall we say?) Colonel Blimp: "These Czech Nationalists are doing well". The Colonel replies: "Grand Fellows". John Bull: "The Welsh Nationalists are getting stronger". Blimp: "I'd shoot the lot". That is how England looks to some of us. We are fighting . . . for the restoration of Luxemburg? Yes, partly. For the independence of Norway? Certainly. For the freedom of Albania? Of course. For the Atlantic Charter? Naturally: "they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live". Ah yes, but the Anglo-Welsh border is so near, and Albania and Luxemburg are so far. We cannot have a Secretary for Wales. The Education Bill has almost ignored us. Our young people are sent to work in England, and English people are sent to work in Wales. And so on. It is hard, sometimes, not to share in the continental charge against England that she is hypocritical. But we still have our hopes of her.

In this scrappy age, *In Our Tongues* (S.P.C.K., 5s.) may be serviceable, attracting those whose reading is limited to paragraphs. Edited by the Rev. J. P. Stevenson, himself a chaplain, it contains 34 items in 128 pages, mostly the work of Anglican chaplains or of Presbyterians belonging to the Iona Community: they consist of talks in "The Padre's Hour", sermons, and addresses, broadcast and otherwise: perhaps the best of them is Dr. J. W. Welch's "St. Francis and Our Need To-day".

Dr. A. M. Chirgwin's *Coming Together* (Livingstone Press, 1s. 6d.) is a handy summary of the ways in which "The Churches Co-operate". From Edinburgh, 1910, it surveys the whole field of Christian endeavour, describing union movements, attempted and successful.

THE PLACE OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY*

By Principal E. J. Price, M.A., B.D.

During my College course as a theological student, rather more than 30 years ago, I was taught little, if any, Systematic Theology. The subject had no assured place in the curriculum. The historical method prevailed throughout. The aim of the course was to make us as competent masters as might be of the Biblical sources, of the History of Christian Doctrine, and of the Philosophy of Religion. We were, indeed, expected to read such books as W. N. Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology* and W. Adams Brown's *Christian Theology in Outline,* but we were not put through any serious discipline on these lines. The reason for this was two-fold. (1) The subject had been deliberately excluded from the University B.D. course on the ground that it involved personal belief, and therefore could not properly be made a matter for examination, and further, that it might possibly impinge upon sectional denominational interests. (2) With an altogether unwarranted confidence in student human nature, our pastors and masters seemed to take the view that, having been presented with the historical and philosophical material, we might be safely left to work out our own theological salvation, instead of being turned out to machine-made pattern. I hasten to add that this was not the policy of all our Congregational Colleges at that time. Fairbairn in Oxford, Forsyth and Garvie in London, were stout systematics, and made certain that their students left College with a firm grasp of Christian truth as a living whole, and not merely as a group of separate themes for historical inquiry.

The net result was that while my fellow-students and myself left College strongly fortified, like Irenæus, with arguments against all heresies that ever were, or could be, we covertly harboured some few of them at least in the recesses of our minds, and entered upon our ministry with a stock of unrelated views, some of which we might have found it hard to reconcile with the mighty affirmations of the Gospel. The need of the world, we were apt to think, was not so much for doctrine, about which there had been so much pother in history, as for "the Spirit of Christ" manifesting itself in the loving and heroic deeds of men of good will.

Then came the war of 1914 and the desolate years of uneasy peace, with their revelation of the insecure hold of the Gospel upon

* A paper read at a Conference of Free Church College Principals at Oxford, the full title being, "The Place of Systematic Theology in the Curriculum, with special reference to the Reformers".

our modern civilization. Out of the agony of those years came the "Theology of Crisis" with its return to the positive affirmations and insights of the Reformers and to the anguished spirit of Kierkegaard. Thus came the significant swing backwards from Philosophical Theism and Natural Theology to a genuinely Christian theology as the intellectual formulation of a unique Word of God addressed to man rather than as the attainment of a knowledge of God through rational inquiry and the exploitation of human need. The need for an assured theology is powerfully pressed home today. In the opinion of many the reaction has gone too far and threatens to issue in a revived traditionalism which tends to defeat its own ends. Nevertheless, it is a pertinent remark, I think of Dr. Cave's, that we cannot rid ourselves of false theologies by the simple device of having no theology at all.

The need, however, is not simply for *a* theology, but for a systematic and connected interpretation of the whole body of Christian truth in organic inter-connexion. In other words, what is called for is not a mere collection of truths derived from various sources and standing side by side as independent units, but an articulated and fully rounded system in which no relevant aspects of theological truth are ignored, and in which the affirmations are so closely related that an essential modification of any one of them is bound to affect the significance of the rest. Theological issues cannot be dealt with *in vacuo;* they imply a specific context. We cannot, for example, consider the nature and extent of the Atonement without being thrown back upon our total view of God and man. For our doctrines of God, Man, and Salvation are inseparably linked up with one another, and must be viewed from a common centre in the Word of God. Our need is for a positive affirmation of the truths of the Christian Gospel as mutually consistent, and yet, in the nature of the case and in the last resort, not excluding the possibility of paradox.

As such an affirmation, Theology stands in a unique position as over against all other intellectual disciplines, and to fail to appreciate that fact is to hand over the case to modern substitutes for the Gospel which concern themselves with man's secular welfare rather than with God's redeeming mercy. P. T. Forsyth declared[1] that during the four centuries which have passed since the Reformation, its principle

> has been moving among many parallel powers, social and intellectual, with a success that threatens to submerge its divine characteristic under its humanitarian and even spiritual affinities. Man's welfare obscures God's glory in a suicidal way. And there are very many . . . to whom its Gospel

[1] *Theology in Church and State,* 103.

> appears to be no more than a most valuable (perhaps the most valuable) branch of spiritual culture, or moral civilization, or humane amelioration. They are tempted to think that any form of belief which is invested with a Christian spirit is a lawful thing in a Church, if only it promise to facilitate the humane ideal and promote fraternal fusion and social weal. That is an entire change of the Christian centre of gravity. It practically makes an anthropocentric instead of a theocentric religion, and it loses God's glory in man's career.

Without a clearly articulated theology there can be no stable Christianity. A mere unintelligent pietism is in danger of giving too much away to science, philosophy, and psychology. William Temple has pointed out that a philosophy is not necessarily a religious philosophy merely because "God is the pivot of it, and apart from the reality of God it would fall to pieces". Descartes' philosophy, he says "sets no value on God in Himself, but only as the lynch-pin of its own mechanism". It does not interpret the world in the light of the knowledge of God, but makes use of God to vindicate its own interpretation of the world, and constructs its concept of Him with that in view. He is to be used for our purpose, not we for His. This, he concludes[2], "is the essential principle of magic, which is thus found as a canker at the heart of Rationalism".

Philosophy therefore can be no substitute for theology. This point is emphasized again and again by Brunner. Let me summarize one characteristic passage: Religion is a form of life which is in the closest connection with the problems peculiar to philosophy, but which has characteristic differences from every school of philosophy, or is even opposed to philosophy. The kinship between the two rests upon the fact that religion as well as philosophy has in view the whole of existence and of life. The opposition between them consists in the fact that religion claims to supply the answer to crucial questions about reality. The answer is in the shape of revelation, and is not the result of the methodical reflection of the intellect within the bounds of reason. Philosophy is confronted with the task of exhibiting the meaning and justification of religion within the mental ground known to philosophy, so that the philosophy of religion is the culminating point of philosophy in general. But religion has something significant to say for itself, and cannot surrender its independence. Christian faith cannot accept the assumption that ultimate validity belongs to the complex of grounds and consequences developed by natural reason. On the contrary, Christian faith involves the recognition that this complex has been broken into by revelation—a revelation upon which the affirmations of Christian faith are grounded.

[2] *Nature, Man and God*, 84 note.

Hence it is only in a secondary sense that we can speak of a Christian philosophy of religion[2a].

Theology therefore stands apart from all philosophy because it is bound to take seriously the unique character of the Christian Gospel as a divine revelation. It "is not a free science void of presuppositions" (Brunner). Its thinking is controlled by the fact of God's revelation of Himself in the whole sacred history that reaches its climax in the death and resurrection of Christ, and the abiding presence of the Living Lord in His Church. In this connexion Kraemer emphasizes what he calls the "radical religious realism" of the Bible, by which he means the radically theocentric point of view which, intensely ethical as it is, subordinates everything to the religious data and confronts us at every point with God, His holy will, His acts, His love, His judgment, as the primary realities with which we have to do. God is the beginning and end of all. "Man and the world are brought in direct, immediate relation to this God, who always takes the initiative".[3] Here is a wealth of insight that cannot be reached by speculative, metaphysical, and philosophical trends of thinking[4], and Kraemer would urge upon us "an open, honest and courageous religious confrontation with and orientation upon the concrete realism of the Bible". "Everywhere", he says,[5]

> in the Christian Church, in the West and in the East, there arises the cry for theology, real theology, in order to give a new and much-needed sense of direction and consistency to Christian thinking, feeling and willing. . . . The Christian faith floats in the present time amidst the surging waves of numerous conflicting and vigorous world-views and of the great massive systems of non-Christian religion. A clear and vigorous conception of what the Christian faith is and stands for is a matter of life and death.

The study of non-Christian religions and the impact of non-Christian ideologies alike compel us to ask what is the specific and unique message of the Gospel to the modern world.

Hence theology must not merely find a place in the curriculum; it must dominate it and shape it from beginning to end. Biblical and historical studies are obviously of the highest importance: nevertheless, they cannot take the place of theology. If they furnish the basis, theology is the crown of the whole structure; if they present the material, theology must provide the form. It is possible for a student to pass brilliantly in Biblical studies, and to have the whole range of History of Doctrine at his finger-ends, and yet be wanting in real theological insight. The question may arise at this

[2a] *The Philosophy of Religion, vide* 11-13.
[3] *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*, 63.
[4] *Ibid.*, 83. [5] *Ibid.*, 83.

point as to whether Dogmatics should be taken in the first theological year, or in the last. On the whole, perhaps the best answer would be that the subject should be studied, if possible, both in the first year and in the last (I am assuming three years in all). During the first year the subject might be taken in a broad outline, so that the student might learn to look beyond the technical details of Biblical and historical studies which accompany or follow the dogmatic outline, and to give them their due place in the total exposition of the Gospel. In the final year the student might then return to Systematic Theology, studied at a deeper level and based upon a wider knowledge of the issues involved. For this purpose there is need of a textbook such as might command general assent, not as authoritative in detail, but as setting out the general lines along which the subject should be treated. Such a textbook need not necessarily represent the teacher's own point of view in its mode of treatment. The important point is that it should be used as a tentative basis for discussion and criticism. Some of us might find Brunner's *The Mediator* and *The Divine Imperative* most useful in this regard. Others may wish to go all out for Barth and Kierkegaard, while others again may feel that even Brunner is too traditional. But this is not the matter of first importance. The significant thing is that the students are to be confronted with a clear, fully thought out, and completely rounded system. They should thus be delivered from the danger of superficiality and made to realize the deep interconnexion between the primary affirmations of theology. Moreover, if they find it impossible to accept certain aspects of doctrine, for example the traditional doctrine of original sin, they should at least be in a position to understand not merely why they reject it, but also why great thinkers of the Church have found it necessary to affirm it, and what the rejection of it implies for the system as a whole.

As to the method of teaching Dogmatics, probably most of us would agree that formal lectures should be reduced to a minimum. Free discussion in Tutorials and Seminars in which the students themselves take an active share, formulating their own criticisms and shaping their own affirmations, will be found more profitable. It is along this line that students are most likely to advance from a mere acquiescence in a truth that is taught, to a vital grasp of a truth that has been personally apprehended. It is important that the discussions should be perfectly free, and not determined by the known predilections of the teacher. Heresy is more likely to be cured by candour than by reproof or repression. And above all, it is important that subjects should be discussed not as independent items in a collection of theological notions, but as elements of a connected whole in which each part is organic to the rest.

Truth is to be approached from many angles if it is to be appreciated in its fullness. Hence students should be taught not to be afraid of paradox, for which there is a real place in Christian theology. Paradox is not of itself a guarantee of truth; yet it may often serve to guard against error. As Kierkegaard characteristically puts it[6]:

> One should not think lightly of the paradoxical: for the paradox is the source of the thinker's passion, and the thinker without a paradox is like a lover without feeling: a paltry mediocrity. . . . The supreme paradox of all thought is the attempt to discover something that thought cannot think.

In Doumergue's words[7]:

> It is the theologies of the enslaved will which have saved liberty; it is the theologies of salvation by another than man which have saved human morality; it is the theologies of renunciation of the world which have saved man's mastery over the world; it is the theologies of man's renunciation of himself which have saved human personality; it is the theologies that preached love towards God alone which have saved love towards all men; it is the theologies of eternal predestination which have saved progress; it is the theologies of heteronomy which have conferred on man an autonomy so fully master of itself as to be master of all else; it is the theologies that said "God is all, man nothing" which have made of man a force, an energy, a power incomparable and divine!

Hence students should be warned against a natural proneness to reject a particular doctrine merely upon the ground that it seems to conflict with another. If both are attested in Christian experience, room must be found, somehow, for both. It is doubtful, for example, whether we shall ever achieve satisfactory categories for so unique a fact as the Incarnation. It is certainly our duty to go as far as we possibly can in the direction of intelligible statement, but Chalcedon warns us that we stand here at the very limits of human knowledge, and must set the divine and the human in Christ side by side "without fusion, without change, without division, without separation". We have here not an exclusive "Either-Or", but a "Both-And", seemingly contradictory, yet inevitable if Christ is to be acknowledged both as God and as Man: "One and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same being perfect in Godhead, and the same being perfect in Manhood, truly God and truly Man, of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead and of one substance with us according to the Manhood". Here is the fundamental paradox upon which depends

[6] *Philosophical Fragments*, 29.
[7] *Jean Calvin*, IV. 394.

all Christian faith and hope. And in the very nature of things it must remain a paradox. Similarly in the opposition of Solifidianism and Synergisim, or between unconditional Election and conditioned Salvation. Brunner points out that the two statements, "everything depends upon God", and "everything depends upon myself", are equally true to Christian experience, and that neither may be surrendered without grave error. Over-simplification in the interests of intellectual neatness may do violence to the truth. Clearly, in these high regions of thought we are confined to symbols, which must always prove imperfect transmitters of meaning. As Dr. G. L. Prestige says[8]:

> How can the finite human mind sum up and describe the nature of the personal being of Almighty God? It cannot, and no reasonable theologian supposes that it can. The utmost that it can achieve in this direction is to sketch out a picture in earthly metaphors and phrases, in the hope that they may convey some sort of parabolic representation consistent with the information which mankind possesses.

Much of what I have said has its background in the teaching of the Reformers, who present us with dogmatic systems of massive proportions and abiding vitality, based upon, but at significant points reacting violently against, the medieval synthesis as represented by Aquinas. The profound and widespread influence of Calvin was, in large measure, due to the fact that he confronted the Counter-Reformation with a theology as consistent and systematic as its own. Moreover, the spiritual culture of this country is still largely moulded by the Reformation; and in the general collapse today of vital Christian belief there is a growing tendency on the part of influential theologians to revert to the Reformation tradition in its entirety. What is called the Neo-Calvinist movement is ready to go to extreme lengths in this direction. No doubt, the basic principles of the Reformation—the appeal to Scripture, the doctrine of Justification by Faith, the reality of divine unmerited Grace, the sole Mediatorship of Christ, the Gospel as a divine revelation to which the Church must submit itself in humble obedience—all these, rightly understood, still stand firm. Nevertheless, in the light of all the critical thinking and the larger insights of the last 250 years, we cannot regard the teaching of the Reformers in detail as wholly free from error. Once more we are brought face to face with the problem of authority and freedom, and before we can deal with it hopefully we need to appreciate both the insights and the limitations of the Reformers, notably of Calvin. It is true, no doubt, that the Methodist Revival, so far as the Wesleys were concerned, was shaped by Arminianism, with its

[8] *Fathers and Heretics*, 184.

rejection of the characteristic ideas of Calvin, but it is a remarkable fact that George Whitefield made his contribution to the Revival from the standpoint of wholehearted Calvinism. Here surely is another "Either-Or", to be resolved somehow into a "Both-And".

I suggest, therefore, that one of the best ways to discipline our students in the field of dogmatics is to take them through one or other of the Reformers, notably Calvin and Melanchthon[8a], as representative and systematic thinkers in the great field of religion. In this way they will be introduced to every vital theological problem, and will be encouraged to appreciate the structural wholeness of Christian theology. There are dangers here to be carefully guarded against, lest, for example, we set up a new Protestant Scholasticism with a one-sided emphasis upon mere orthodoxy. It would be fatal to turn out students as machine-made types, guaranteed by a slavish acceptance of Reformation doctrine, and proclaiming from the pulpit a Reformation teaching that has no serious Reformation thinking behind it. A mere escape to traditionalism is likely to promote that very reaction towards unbelief which it seeks to avoid. On the other hand, an intelligent and discriminating study of the Reformers is probably the best means of approach to a genuinely systematic theology, and will make for spiritual health and vitality.

But here emerges for the student an even more difficult task, namely, that of interpreting to the common man the insight that he has gained for himself through contact with great minds, and through reflection and discussion. As a preacher he must learn to proclaim the Word of God in language understood of the people. Technical theology, with its specific terminology, must lie in the background rather than in the forefront of his preaching. The foreground should be occupied by the truth as he understands it, presented in simple, vivid and telling phraseology. Over and over again Luther and Calvin insist upon the necessity of clearness and simplicity both in thought and in language, and every generation needs to discover its own method of exposition. Inasmuch as theology must always address itself to the man of the present generation, it is bound to wear different aspects at different times, although ultimately it is always dealing with the same problems and the same truth[9]. On the other hand, according to Forsyth, we must be on our guard against banishing from popular currency the great words that keep us in line with the historic faith and experience. He urges that it is not so much new words that we want, instead of the great words like Justification, but new interpretations of them.

[8a] Melanchthon has at once a warmer, more logical and less rigid mind than Luther, but alas! is practically inaccessible in English.

[9] See Brunner, *Philosophy of Religion*, 189.

It is a special weakness of Systematic Theology in these modern days that the Christian faith has tended to become sharply separated from the Christian life. There is need for a new orientation of Moral Theology in order that the day by day issues of Christian conduct may be rightly handled from the standpoint of a realistic theology. Christian theology being what it is, we have the right to demand guidance on such matters as the Family, Divorce, the Church and the State, as well as on Education and Economics, and, in so far as Christian principles are involved, on industrial and commercial practice. What is the relevance of Christianity for the kinds of moral decision which Christians in every walk of life may have to make in their day by day activity in this 20th century? A mere traditionalism in these matters will fail to meet the problems of present day Christian conduct, precisely at the points where strain is most deeply realized. Medieval Systematic Theology tended to confine Moral Theology to ecclesiastical issues and failed to grapple persistently with social issues. Its ethical insights were to some extent debased by the production of Manuals for Confessors, which were void of systematic principle:

> The present task of the systematic theologian is hard and grievous because the issues lie on the borders of the religious and the technical. But that is all the more reason for wholehearted and persistent study and teaching of the making of Christian moral decisions in a world of shifting uncertainty[10].

Perhaps Brunner in *The Divine Imperative* has defined more clearly than others the scope of this subject in its modern setting. Nevertheless, while admitting this new emphasis, we must guard against the danger of transforming Christianity into a mere ethical system. Actually the Reformers, with their non-legalistic point of view, may help us here, inasmuch as they were not concerned in their ethical insights with the moral action of the natural man, but with the action of those who, having been redeemed from sin, have become new creatures, and having been freed from the bondage of the law of sin and death, are now under higher law unto Christ.

I conclude by drawing attention to some dogmatic issues which call for a new approach on the basis of the Reformation tradition. (1) In view of the Reformers' appeal to Scripture, we need a clearer understanding of the nature and degree of the authority which is to be ascribed to the Bible as revelation, and in particular of the place of the Old Testament within the context of revelation. With all that we have gained from the modern historical view of the

[10] I take this from an unpublished paper of my colleague, Professor Cunliffe-Jones.

Scriptures, it would appear that something has been lost, so that we are no longer able, as clearly as in former days, to lay down a positive and regulative use of the Bible for the theologian. It is doubtful whether our former confidence in the whole of Scripture as revelation can ever be recovered. It is the massive and impressive testimony of the Scriptures as a whole which must constitute our appeal to the Bible, rather than their casual or detailed pronouncements. In this region it is not easy for students to find their way with confidence. What, in the Bible, is revelation and what is not? And if revelation, how is it tested and approved? The whole subject needs to be thought through carefully, especially in view of revived tendencies towards the traditional view. There is an urgent need for a new Biblical Theology as the basis of our systematic thinking. We have got beyond the unintelligent Biblicism which settled great issues on the authority of random texts. There are numerous departmental studies at our disposal, dealing with Synoptic and Johannine teaching, with the teaching of Paul, and with the religious ideas of the Old Testament—all very important in themselves. But our deeper need is for a clearer understanding of the great central reality toward which these are witnesses, and upon which alone we can build securely.

(2) Natural Theology. Is any knowledge of God obtainable apart from revelation in Scripture? The warning of Barth against the danger of reducing Christian faith to the level of something that is purely rational is timely and valid. His complete rejection of natural theology, however, raises very difficult problems. As Kraemer says[11]:

> He does not deny that there must exist something common between God and man, which makes it possible for man "to hear God's Word". . . . He will not and cannot deny *that* God works and has worked in man outside the Biblical sphere of revelation, but *how* this has happened he refuses to discuss. . . . The universal religious consciousness of man and the results of his endeavour to obtain an apprehension of the totality of existence cannot be dismissed as outside discussion. The testimony of the Bible in the Acts and the Epistles breathes a freer, more human, more positive spirit, despite its uncompromising attitude towards the world. The perception of Divinity (Sensus divinitatis) operative in mankind, asserted by Calvin, is in the religious realism of the Bible no object of discussion, but a working hypothesis that goes without saying. Here lie the necessity and legitimacy of Brunner's protest, and of his combat in favour of a critical and right kind of natural theology; for, although beset with many possibilities of error, we must somehow try to talk about it.

[11] *Op. cit.*, 120-121.

(3) The Fall and Original Sin. In what way can we interpret these doctrines today? In abandoning the story of Eden as unhistorical, what do we mean now by the Fall of Man? And what is our view of the *imago Dei*? Is human nature merely impaired, or is it radically corrupt? Is any concord possible between the Augustinianism of the Reformers, and the Pelagian libertarian ethic? Niebuhr states the case thus (*The Nature and Destiny of Man*, I. 276):

> We cannot . . . escape the ultimate paradox that the final exercise of freedom in the transcendent human spirit is its recognition of the false use of that freedom in action. Man is most free in the discovery that he is not free. This paradox has been obscured by most Pelagians and by many Augustinians. The Pelagians have been too intent to assert the integrity of man's freedom to realize that the discovery of this freedom also involves the discovery of man's guilt. The Augustinians, on the other hand, have been so concerned to prove that the freedom of man is corrupted by sin that they have not fully understood that the discovery of this sinful taint is an achievement of freedom.

These are issues of first-rate importance to the student. He must be challenged and helped to make up his mind about them.

(4) Similarly with the doctrine of Election. Can it be affirmed in a way that does no despite to human personality and responsibility? And if not, what must be surrendered? Or is it a case of "Both-And" rather than "Either-Or"?

Thus, whatever our attitude to the teaching of the Reformers as a whole, we cannot but recognize that they lead us to the very heart of our systematic problems. We may reject their solutions in detail, but at the very least we are bound to consider their premisses and take into account their insights with a view to safeguarding the theological inheritance which comes to us from the Reformation, and with a view to confronting the growing paganism of the modern world with the reality of God and of His redeeming grace as the only abiding principle of newness of life and power.

ALSO RECEIVED.

A Christian Year Book, 1945. We are glad to see that a new edition of this very useful book has been possible. The section on religious education is particularly pertinent.

Evelyn A. Downs. *The Bible as Drama.* R.E.P. 1s. 6d. "An Exposition of the Educational Value of Bible Plays, with Four Typical Illustrations".

The Royal Albert Hall Campaign, 1944. Pickering. 6s. & 5s. Addresses in "The Faith for the Times" Campaign.

Catherine Baird. *William Stevens, Jeweller and Missionary.* Salvation Army. 1s. 6d. The stirring story of a devoted soldier of Christ, whose early zeal was kindled by Thomas Davies, of Worthing Congregational Church.

Edward H. Joy. *The Old Corps.* Salvation Army. 2s.

Hal Beckett. *Some of China's Children.* Salvation Army. 2s. Stories effectively told.

The third edition of Dr. A. D. Belden's *Pax Christi* is issued by Carwal Publications at 3s. 6d.

THE LIBERAL REVIVAL

By Elliott Dodds, M.A.

Some months ago the Editor invited me to contribute an article on "Can Liberalism Revive?" I have substituted "The Liberal Revival" as a title; for this revival is a fact. In proof may I quote a few incidents from my own experience? Each in itself may seem trifling, but, taken together, they signify a shift of opinion that may transform the whole pattern of British politics. Here, then, they are. During recent weeks I have been approached by three persons in my own town who wanted to know how they could join the Liberal Party. One was a business man of middle age who had always voted Conservative, but after studying the Liberal record had decided that he had been in the wrong camp and must transfer his allegiance; another was a young professional man who had hitherto taken no active interest in politics but felt that he ought to be up and doing and that the Liberal policy was most in accord with his views; the third was a Free Church minister who had been attracted by Commonwealth, but had come to the conclusion that it was no good and had made up his mind, on Christian grounds, that it was his duty to come out as a Liberal.

To these I may add a solicitor who has written to me from the Midlands saying that he has always been a Labour supporter, but is now drawn to the Liberal Party; a young man engaged in social work in London who says that he wants to do something worth while with his life and feels a call to active service for Liberalism; and an Anglican vicar who has never identified himself with any party, but has been so much impressed by the reports of the Liberal Assembly that he is urgently concerned that there should be a Liberal candidate in the constituency where he lives so that he may be able to vote for him.

One swallow—even a sextet of swallows—does not make a summer; but these incidents, which could be multiplied indefinitely from the experience of other Liberals, are indicative of a definite change. Quite unquestionably there is a movement towards Liberalism, both among those who have formerly been attached to other parties, and (what is much more important) among the unattached, whose votes will decide the issue of the next election. This trend, which is marked among the "stay-at-homes", is observable also in the Services, and would be more so if greater opportunities for political discussion existed. I myself have received numerous letters from men and women in the Forces, evoked by an article which I wrote for the Army newspaper, *Union*

Jack, saying that they believe that the great majority of their comrades are "Liberals without knowing it", and could be won over if only the case for Liberalism were put before them properly.

At the same time, Liberal Headquarters have been almost embarrassed by the flood of recruits. Candidates (many of them young men in the Forces) have been coming forward in large numbers. Liberal Associations in the country have been "wakkening up", and in many constituencies where there has been no Liberal activity for many years new organizations are being formed. Liberal doings have been receiving much more attention in the Press and on the wireless, and even newspapers which are hostile to the Liberal Party have been predicting that it will have a big come-back at the next election. Most significant of all, perhaps, has been Sir William Beveridge's entry into the political arena as a Liberal and the effect which this has had in convincing the man in the street that the Liberal Party, which he had regarded as bankrupt, is a going concern. I remember, some years before the war, attending a luncheon at which a distinguished Liberal was speaking. "We are on the eve", he declared, "of a great Liberal revival"; and then he added, *sotto voce,* "I have said that so often that I am almost coming to believe it". Today the Liberal revival is not a figment of wishful thinking, but a substantial reality, of which there is "no probable, possible, shadow of doubt, no possible doubt whatever".

How far this revival extends, and how far it will go, are open questions; but all who recognize that, as Mr. Harold Nicolson has said, "In this clash of sectional interests all men of goodwill should concentrate on the assertion and defence of those Liberal principles which have been the foundation, not of our greatness only, but of all the great good this small island has given to the world", must hope that it will continue to grow until the forces of Liberalism, at present apparently so feeble, stand on their feet "an exceeding great army".

Liberalism, now, has been out of the picture for the best (or the worst) part of a quarter of a century. The results may be read in events. It is no mere accident, as Lady Violet Bonham-Carter has said, that its eclipse has coincided with a period of social stagnation at home and of tyranny, barbarism, and aggression abroad. In a major degree the one thing has been due to the other.

Historians, I believe, will say that the ousting of the Liberal Party by the Labour Party as the obvious alternative to Toryism has been a major calamity both for this country and for the world. Perhaps I had better explain what I mean by that statement. In former times, when the country grew tired of the Tories it put in the Liberals. After the Tory *débâcle* in 1906 this resulted in the greatest chapter in Liberal achievement. When, however, the

Labour Party elbowed out the Liberal Party a great change took place. The country had so little confidence in the Labour Party, and was so determined not to have Socialism, that it continued to put the Tories in, not because it wanted them, but because it wanted Labour even less. The consequence was the long and miserable period of Tory dominance. There were, it is true, two brief interludes in which the Labour Party was kept in office by Liberal votes, but Labour (although it had effective power) proved so feeble and ineffectual that it only enhanced the general cynicism about politics and made further grist for the Tories. Under Baldwin, MacDonald, and Chamberlain the nation, unhappy about itself and ashamed of its Governments, staggered through years of mass unemployment to the World War.

The reasons for the eclipse of the Liberal Party are many—the effects of war and its aftermath; Lloyd George's alliance with the Tories; the constant splits and secessions; the hang-over of *laissez-faire;* the neglect by Liberal leaders to stress the social gospel of Liberalism; and, by no means least, the fact that, while nothing succeeds like success, nothing fails like a failure. Most important of all, however, was the climate of the period. "A cloud was on the minds of men, and wailing went the weather". The Age of Faith had given place to an Age of Scepticism. The great beliefs on which Liberalism rests no longer commanded allegiance. Man's status as a person, which it exists to assert, was challenged on every side, and the new totalitarian cults of Fascism and Communism, although at loggerheads with each other, combined to ridicule it. The intellectuals—or many of them—had become nihilist. Fixed principles were at a discount, and relativity, the new theory which was causing such a stir in the field of physics, was carried over into the fields of politics and morals. "Liberty" was spoken of with a sneer, Parliamentary democracy was scoffed at, "individualism" became a byword. It was not merely that the Liberal Party fell upon evil days; the very ideas which it represented ceased to be fashionable. The old gods had been overthrown, and men, worshipping new gods, had yet to realize that they were devils.

Again, it was no mere accident that this eclipse of Liberalism coincided with the weakening of religion—and particularly the weakening of the Free Churches. Prof. D. W. Brogan significantly linked the two together when he wrote in *The English People:*

> In the generation that has passed since *the great Liberal landslide of 1906,* one of the greatest changes in the English religious and social landscape has been the decline of Nonconformity.

The peculiar values for which the Free Churches (and especially Congregationalism) stood—the sturdy traditions of independency;

the insistence on the rights of private judgment and conscience; the rule of democracy in church affairs; the emphasis on the infinite worth of the individual—were, in the political field, the values of Liberalism. Naturally, therefore, the one declined with the other. Will they revive together also? History alone can show; but this, at least, may be said, that if Nonconformity takes sides with Collectivism (as some of its spokesmen have been inclined to do) it will stand to forfeit its share in the counter-reaction which has set in, and which centres round the assertion of personal rights, submerged for a while, but now so manifestly coming into their own again.

For this, really, is the secret of the Liberal revival—the rediscovery that men matter as *men*, and that totalitarianism, whatever shape it takes, is of the Devil. On the Continent, the old Liberal watchwords—liberty, democracy, the rule of law—have again become battle-cries. Men, having shown themselves ready to die for them, are now getting ready for the even harder task of living for them. This, surely, is the meaning of "liberation"; for unless the basic human rights are established one tyranny will merely succeed another. The Continental countries are looking eagerly to Britain as the mother of Liberalism. The B.B.C. knows this, and that, no doubt, is why it makes so much of Liberal proposals and affairs in its foreign broadcasts. As I was writing these very lines there came into my hands a memorandum prepared by a Liberal official in which he writes:

> I want to record the most exciting thing that happens at my desk. It is the profound interest in European countries in what looks like a Liberal revival here. Representatives come to me from Switzerland, Sweden, Holland, Belgium, France, and so forth, all with the same story; that their countries see in a Liberal revival here the first real ground for hope they have seen in political affairs for years. They are very anxious to be assured that it is genuine.

Meantime, Englishmen, with the hideous object-lesson of Europe in front of them, have been stung to realize that the old Liberal values, which they were disposed to depreciate, are of supreme importance, although they require to be asserted in new ways and in a new context. They may not have philosophized about the matter very deeply—that is not their habit—but they are solidly set on freedom; freedom, emphatically, from "fear and want", but freedom, too, of personal choice, freedom from arbitrary restriction, freedom of opportunity and occupation, freedom to live their own lives in their own way.

It is here that the Liberal Party has so unique a chance, for it alone is capable of presenting a policy which promises both sorts of freedom. This point calls for some elaboration. In Victorian

days "liberty" had one clear and simple meaning—freedom from oppression, domestic or foreign; freedom of speech, of meeting, of writing; civil and political freedom; freedom from needless government interference. That, however, was a one-sided interpretation, and more and more we have come to appreciate that liberty of this sort is incomplete, as a guarantee of man's status as a person, without what is called "economic liberty". This phrase, again, has changed its meaning, for whereas it used to signify freedom of trade, in all its applications, today it is more commonly employed to signify economic security—freedom from unemployment, a social minimum, decent wages, good housing, and so forth. Sir William Beveridge put the position very simply in his speech at the Liberal Assembly when he said:

> Liberty means more than freedom from the arbitrary power of governments. It means freedom from economic servitude to want and squalor and other social evils. A starving man is not free because till he is fed he cannot have a thought for anything but how to meet his urgent physical needs; he is reduced from a man to an animal.

This is perfectly true, and it cannot be emphasized too much. The main reason why liberty came to be so poorly esteemed in the period between the wars was that it failed to provide the economic security which is the basis of tolerable human living. At the same time it is necessary to insist that, just as political and civil liberty is insufficient as a guarantee of personal rights, so economic security, however essential, is not enough by itself. A man may be freed from "want and squalor" in a slave compound—or in a totalitarian State, which comes to much the same thing. But he cannot be a *free man*. In order to be that he must enjoy the vital citizen rights. Liberty, indeed, means more than freedom from "the arbitrary power of governments"; but such freedom is an indispensable part of it. One may go further and say that it is its foundation. The great problem of our time is to combine these two sorts of freedom; to reconcile the "planning" which is necessary in order to establish economic security with the political and civil rights of men as persons. And this problem Liberalism alone can solve.

Let us look at the alternatives. Conservatism's conception of society is hierarchic. It has never acknowledged equality of human rights. Its history is the record of one long and stubbornly-fought battle to maintain the ascendancy of the privileged classes, and, behind all the surrenders it has been compelled to make, its *ethos* remains the same. It will patch here and there, thus giving an impression of being progressive, but its dependence on the great vested interests inhibits it from undertaking any fundamental change in the social structure. Formerly the most important of

these interests was Land; today it is Big Business. This fact forces Conservatism to oppose the controls which are essential if there is to be full economic opportunity. It talks loudly about "freedom of enterprise", but what it really means is freedom of action for the great corporations which have acquired such power under its encouragement. In Victorian days absence of State control may have meant free competition; today it would mean its exact opposite—control by monopoly, which of all forms of arbitrary government is the worst. The "industrial self-government" which Conservatism supports spells industrial Fascism—the Corporativist State, with a democratic veneer. The great corporations would dominate the legislature, and, having the power to fix prices and dictate conditions of trading, would hold consumers to ransom and freeze out any new enterprise. Moreover, the restrictive practices legalized under such a system would reduce the standard of living and render full employment impossible.

The Labour Party poses as the champion of the dispossessed and makes a great point of economic security, which, it asserts, can never be achieved under a private enterprise system. Like the Conservative Party, however, it is dominated by vested interests—the interests of the great trade unions—and these sometimes conflict with the greatest good of the greatest number, even among the classes which it claims particularly to represent. It is tied to Socialism, which, if it means anything, means the dictatorship of "the omnicompetent State"—and that is even more plainly irreconcilable with the rights of men as persons. If the State, owning and operating all the means of production, distribution and exchange, "plans" everything, personal freedom *must* go by the board.

Individual enterprise, of course, will be eliminated, and no man will be free to set up in business on his own. Labour will have to be directed, and freedom of choice of occupation will go, since the State will be sole employer and the plan cannot be operated if the workers are free to choose their jobs and to move from one to another. The right to strike will go along with it, since the plan must not be held up by industrial stoppages—and strike-breaking will be easy when every worker is a State employee who can be placed under military law. The consumer, too, will lose his freedom of choice, since distribution will be monopolized by the State. The printing-presses will be State-owned, and the newspapers will be allowed to publish only what Authority approves. Government *must* be arbitrary, for, with the State running the whole business of the nation, it must be utterly impossible to maintain democratic control. Day-to-day decisions affecting every aspect of personal life will be in the hands of officials against whose acts the ordinary man will have no redress, and Parliament will have little more to do than to register the Executive's decrees.

This is not a caricature of what *might* happen under an over-all planned economy; it is a literal description of what *has* happened; and, although in this country such a system would probably be less oppressive (and less efficient) than it has been elsewhere, its logic is unescapable. Socialism, however amiable the intentions of its advocates, means the extinction of the rights of men as persons; and this is every bit as true when it masquerades under the *alias* of "Common Ownership" as when it figures under its own name.

So, by a process of elimination, we come back to Liberalism—Liberalism, the traditional trustee of liberty, which, influenced by no vested interests and hobbled by no doctrinaire formulæ, is free to judge all questions by the practical test of the common good. The old Liberals did a great work in destroying class privileges and establishing equal civil and political rights. It is true that their conception of economic freedom was too negative and that they underestimated the part which the State must play, not merely in removing hindrances, but in creating the positive conditions of self-development. By the time, however, that the great Liberal landslide of 1906 took place, it had come to be realized that large numbers of the people were living in what amounted to economic serfdom and that only the State could ameliorate their condition. The consequence was the great code of social legislation which was placed on the Statute-book between 1906 and 1914.

The experience of the period between the two wars, with its continuing poverty and phenomenal unemployment, in spite of immense technical progress, made it clear that more radical action must be taken; and during recent years, the Liberal Party, although it has had no opportunity of putting its ideas into effect, has been engaged in working out practical schemes for remedying the abuses of the private enterprise system without sacrificing the liberties which it still regards as of paramount importance. The aim of its programme is not to make the State universal dictator and provider, which would spell the death of individual freedom and enterprise, but to establish a framework of freedom which will provide the reality of economic as well as political liberty for all citizens.

Liberals are not afraid of "planning", but they would confine it within definite limits. They recognize that the State must undertake new and larger responsibilities, and that in doing so it must interfere with certain personal rights; but they are keenly alive to the dangers of extending its functions indefinitely and realize that the more it undertakes the more needful it is to insist on precautions against the abuse of its powers. Sir William Beveridge has stated the principle which underlies their programme in his book, *Full Employment in a Free Society*—

> to propose for the State only those things which the State alone

> can do or which it can do better than any local authority or than private citizens either singly or in association, and to leave to these other agencies that which, if they will, they can do as well as or better than the State.

Space does not allow me to enter into the details of this programme. They may be studied, by those who are interested, in the Reports which have been issued by the Liberal Party and in the resolutions adopted at its recent Assembly. Summing up, it may be said that Liberals would have the State act as regulator, not as tyrant—maintaining direct control at key points, such as land and monetary policy; ensuring an adequate social minimum for all; strengthening the law against restraint of trade; controlling or taking over monopolies where expert inquiry shows them to be inevitable; "compensating the balance of private transactions" in order to secure that the human and material resources of the nation shall be fully employed; but in the main leaving it to personal initiative and enterprise to supply the driving-force, multiplying opportunities for the individual, and exerting every effort to encourage originality and variety. Everywhere and all the time their aim is to give a better chance to more people to realize themselves as persons.

"The essential and primordial objective for which men assemble within the political community", says Maritain, in *The Rights of Man,*

> is to procure the common good of the multitude, in such a manner that each concrete person, not only in a privileged class, but throughout the whole mass, may truly reach that measure of independence which is proper to civilized life, and which is ensured alike by the economic guarantees of work and property, political rights, civil virtues and the cultivation of the mind.

This is the Liberal objective, and I am profoundly convinced, it can only be attained by Liberal methods. No Congregationalist would say that there are no Christians outside Congregationalism, nor would I as a Liberal say that there are no men and women of Liberal mind outside the Liberal Party. But, just as I believe that Congregationalism embodies the very heart of the Christian witness, and that the central truths for which it stands would be neglected without the Congregational Churches, so I believe that Liberalism cannot be effective without a Party that makes its principles central.

In the great days when the Nonconformist Conscience was a power in the land, there was little doubt where the Free Churches stood—so little so that it might have been said, "Scratch a Free Churchman and find a Liberal". Of recent years, however, their voice in political affairs has been hesitating and confused. The

Liberal revival, which shows that the values which it has been their peculiar privilege to maintain are winning their way to recognition again, should encourage them to take their stand with the political force which represents their own traditions, and needs their support so badly. "Now is the time for all good men to come to the help of the Party"—the Party which has blazed the trail of freedom in the past and which today offers the means of reconciling economic security with civil and political liberty. If all who care for the rights of men as persons rally to its banner, Liberalism will once more become a dominant force in its country of origin, and a Liberal Britain may give the lead to the world.

It is probable that most readers of these pages are Dissenters, though they no longer call themselves so; and Dissenters, Matthew Arnold proclaimed to the world, are philistines. As it has probably to be admitted that most readers of these pages would rather read Mr. Neville Cardus on cricket than on music, Mr. Matthew Arnold's successors, if any, will feel themselves justified. It would be foolish, however, for anyone to regard Mr. Cardus's *Ten Composers* (Cape, 8s. 6d.) as caviare to the general: musical people, of course, will read it with keen appreciation; but all with any aspirations at all after culture could benefit from Mr. Cardus's style even if his musical criticism passed over their heads. And it need not, judging by our own experience, though we confess we started in the middle with Elgar, went on to Delius and Sibelius, and then turned to begin with Schubert, through Wagner, Brahms, Mahler (of whom we knew nothing), Strauss, César Franck, and Debussy. Mr. Cardus is always readable, though if he must repeat a figure like pippins ripening in Gloucestershire within four pages, let us have "pippins" spelt the same way: Hammond may repeat a drive through the covers twice in an over, and Schubert perform its musical counterpart, but in writing it isn't done, especially by one like Mr. Cardus, who has strokes all round the wicket. Here is a glimpse of him:

> The world of music at times unfolds itself to the fancy in the shapes and altitudes of the physical universe. There, in the upper ether, reposes the mountain of Bach; farther away in a fiercer light the peak of Palestrina pierces the heavens like a spear; in a middle height the warmth of a more humane air makes fertile the slopes of the Handel range; the volcano of Beethoven smokes ominously yet, but there are wooded uplands enriched for ever by the lava of the first eruption. The enchanted lake of Debussy dreams in the distance; there are the courts and palaces and lawns of Mozart; there is the country estate of Haydn; there are rocks and crags and thunder to the right, where the Wagnerian surge is never still. And standing aloof, rising from a plateau, is the cathedral of César Franck.

Mr. W. G. Addison's *Religious Equality in Modern England* (S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.) surveys the struggle for religious freedom from 1714 to 1914. Nonconformists would be well advised to study it, for it covers the period of the rise and fall of their influence on political life. Mr. Addison brings out well the way in which Home Rule for Ireland sidetracked the question of Disestablishment of the English Church. Before 1951 some student should examine the figures of the religious census of 1851; even if they were exaggerated from the Dissenters' side they still give much ground for disturbed reflection as we compare the position today.

THE AMERICAN CHURCHES LOOK AHEAD

By the Rev. RICHARD M. FAGLEY, M.A.

THE current attitude of church people in the United States contrasts sharply with the attitude prevalent in the corresponding period of the last war. Then, our churches, like the majority of our people, were swept up in a wave of confidence that victory and the League of Nations would insure rather automatic progress toward the Promised Land. Their own moral aims were read into the conflict. Their belief in a bright tomorrow for Christian efforts was strong. Their preparations for actual post-war problems were slight. Consequently, the war was followed by profound disillusionment, which undercut the will to make the most of the limited opportunities presented by the Allied victory.

Today, our churches are pre-conditioned against illusions of an easy road after victory. Leaders and congregations are more aware of the great difficulties ahead, and more determined to deal with them intelligently and persistently. We sense the enormous task of reconstruction, even though we do not fully grasp its complexity.

A predominant concern among thinking Christians is for an organization strong enough to keep the peace and just enough to make it worth keeping. This concern has been expressed in repeated pronouncements by nearly all the responsible religious bodies. It has also been expressed in a unique seven-point Declaration called *The Pattern for Peace,* signed by top-ranking Protestant, Catholic and Jewish leaders (which, incidentally, was furthered by the *Ten Points,* and has in turn been commended by British religious leaders). International organization is recognized as our crucial social problem. There are still differences of opinion about the League of Nations, but our church leadership is generally agreed that we need more international organization, not less; we need peace machinery with greater authority and power, not less.

Our church leaders do not minimize the international obstacles to such an organization, nor the obstacles in this country to effective American participation. The danger that war-time allies, particularly allies as diverse as the United Nations, will fall apart once the common enemies are defeated, is widely recognized. The difficulty of completing the proposals for the post-war United Nations in a manner to inspire confidence in the peoples large and small is largely understood. While some of our religious "perfectionists" will no doubt criticize the compromise agreements issuing from the various conferences, I believe that most American churchmen will support them. They will do so, not because the agreements will

match the religious ideals of world order, but because the agreements will offer the last, best hope in our time for progress towards adequate international organization. They will support the proposals, because the alternative is a naked struggle for power leading to a more devastating world conflict.

Despite the current interpretation of the election results as a mandate for post-war collaboration, there is little tendency among church leaders here to minimize the question-mark which still hovers over American policy. A major reason for this uncertainty is the unpredictable course of the Senate. A two-thirds vote of the Senate is required to ratify treaties. While a few of the Senators opposed to collaboration were retired to private life by their constituencies in the November elections, there is still a strong minority of "isolationists", and a larger group whose attitude is uncertain. If the vote on the United Nations is long delayed by negotiations or debate, it will not be easy to predict the result. The opponents of collaboration are not likely to oppose it directly, in view of its popular support. The opposition is more likely to concentrate on subsidiary issues, relying on a combination of personal, political, and regional as well as international antagonisms to muster the thirty-three votes needed to block a treaty. The chances for collaboration are brighter than they were twenty-five years ago, but they are still uncertain.

A more profound reason for the present uncertainty is the state of public opinion. Senator Joseph H. Ball of Minnesota, the independent Republican who supported President Roosevelt because of his foreign policy, estimated some weeks ago that at the present stage in the last war ten per cent of the American people were actively in favor of the League, seventy per cent were generally favorable but confused as to its implications, and twenty per cent were opposed. His estimate for the present stage of this war was twenty per cent committed to collaboration, seventy per cent favorable but confused, and ten per cent opposed. The elections revealed both that public opinion is moving towards a better understanding of American responsibilities in the world, and that it still has a long way to go.

The large middle group, therefore, is the underlying source of uncertainty. Today it is generally convinced by the second world war in a generation that peace must be organized and made secure. But this conviction is not yet firm enough to withstand surely all flank attacks—the flank attacks of anti-British, anti-Soviet, anti-European, or anti-Asiatic ideas; the flank attacks created by secondary international disputes; the flank attacks created by domestic issues. The danger that minor issues will obscure the main purpose of collective security has decreased, but not disappeared.

Why this should be so is not far to seek. We in America have not been as shaken from pre-war attitudes as peoples who have faced, and are facing, more obvious and immediate perils and privations. The war is very real to millions of American families whose boys are fighting and dying with your boys on distant fronts. Even so, the war seems far away. The threat of a direct invasion has been remote, our cities have not been bombed, war-time restrictions have been comparatively slight. The black fate from which the United Nations have been spared, or from which they are being liberated, seems somehow unreal. The atrocities piled on atrocities have been too numerous and unbelievable for the imagination to grasp. The terror, the suffering, the hate, have seemed part of another world. These are reasons why the compelling necessity of collective security has not yet gripped the whole of our people.

Our church leaders, therefore, are devoting increasing attention to the critical decision on international organization which looms before our government and people, as before the rest of the United Nations. Denominational programs have been launched to help clarify and enlist the convictions of church members in behalf of international collaboration. The Methodists conducted a "Crusade for a New World Order" last year and are continuing the same emphasis in their current "Crusade for Christ". The Northern and Southern Baptists started world-order programs last May. Our Congregational Christian churches signed a "World Order Compact"[1] the same month and dedicated the 150,000 commitments at the General Council in June. During the summer the Disciples of Christ conducted special educational programs. In the autumn, the Presbyterians initiated a nation-wide "World Order Movement". Women of twenty-six denominations joined in November to sign a pledge in support of international collaboration. And leaders of the different faiths joined in a number of cities to sponsor civic mass meetings on *The Pattern for Peace*.

This January Protestant leaders are meeting in Cleveland to intensify and focus this work for the organization of peace. The problem is chiefly one of Christian strategy: how best to support the United Nations organization as a first step towards a better world order; how to bring home to our church people the full import of the present struggle for the United Nations; how to help

[1] The text of the Compact, adapted from the Mayflower Compact, is as follows:—

In the name of God, Amen. We whose names are underwritten, loyal members of ..... Church of ..... do solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together to work for a just and cooperative world order. We pray that our nation shall help to establish an international organization for the better ordering of the interdependent life of nations, the preservation of peace with justice, and the furtherance of the general good of all peoples. Unto this great task we commit our wills and our ways. In witness whereof we have hereunder subscribed our names. Anno Domini, 1944.

church members express their convictions effectively and appropriately in the political sphere. These are practical issues which confront church leaders in the months just ahead.

The question of post-war organization is a pivotal issue because it conditions all the other international and national problems. If there is a strong security system, then the complex problems of world trade are open to sensible solution. Lacking such a system, the world would be divided in a new war of trade, tariffs, cartels, in which all nations would suffer, but particularly the weaker nations. If there is a stable security system, then international standards and guarantees can be developed for the welfare and freedom of dependent peoples. Lacking such a system, the great powers would be involved in an open scramble for bases, spheres of interest, and colonies. The same "either-or" applies to social problems within the United States. All the social concerns of the Christian community hang upon the question whether we are to live in a post-war or a pre-war world.

This does not mean, of course, that the various international and domestic issues confronting our churches wait upon the decision regarding international organization. On the contrary, they press for a solution ever more insistently. The emerging social problems of the post-war world, superimposed upon the war-time tasks of our churches, place a great strain upon the personnel and resources of our religious agencies. The responsibilities of church officials have multiplied, and a large percentage of the younger men, who could normally carry part of this load, are serving as chaplains with the armed forces. Your churches in Britain are undoubtedly feeling the same great pressure of responsibilities new and old. The result here is that none of the social concerns of our congregations can be given the attention it needs and deserves. This applies to the issue of international organization as well as to the other issues.

The problems of relief and reconstruction are high on the horizon as the churches look forward. No social task is closer to the Christian conscience than the physical and spiritual healing of the nations. Yet American churchmen recognize that the needs of war-torn peoples are so vast, and the material resources of the churches comparatively so limited. The churches have an indispensable ministry to the needs of men which secular agencies cannot provide. But mass relief needs can be met only by national, indeed only by international, action, and then only in part. The great service open to the churches is to fortify the motives of brotherhood among our people, which form the wellspring of a whole-hearted relief program.

Of great importance, too, is the opportunity our churches have to help the Christian communities old and new to rebuild their

institutions and services. It is recognized that the main burden of rebuilding will of necessity be carried by the churches of war-torn lands, but there is also a manifest desire among church leaders here to help in any way possible. The concrete cooperation developed in the tasks of reconstruction will help to set the pattern for the fellowship of tomorrow.

The problems of post-war America loom large in the thoughts and plans of our church leaders, both because they are urgent and because their solution need not wait entirely on international consultations. The dislocations of the war have been less than in most of the United Nations. Nevertheless, the drafting of eleven million young men into the armed services, the shift of millions of war-workers and the conversion of large sectors of the factories to war production, create grave human and economic problems. There are more crowded and more depleted communities than ever before. There are more dislocated and separated families than ever before. There are more children without adequate parental care than ever before. Consequently our church leaders are approaching the problems of demobilization and reconversion with a sense of great need. The Christian mission at home never faced a greater task.

The experience of our chaplains is throwing new light on the importance and techniques of effective Christian education. In particular, the place of pastoral counselling is given new significance. The chaplains, as they return, are certain to bring to the ministry as a whole a fresh and valuable approach to the care of souls. New emphasis is also likely to be given to training in Christian vocation in general and to training in the Christian ministry in particular.

While the technical problems of re-adjustment may be less difficult in the United States than in many other countries, because the war has placed comparatively less strain upon the national life, the psychological problems may be relatively greater, and chiefly for the same reason. In Britain, for example, both soldiers and civilians have been at the front during the war. In this country, however, civilians have been far from the front. Consequently, there is far more room for misunderstanding between soldiers and civilians. Resentments over the inequalities of sacrifice, on the one hand, and inabilities to comprehend war experiences, on the other, present a challenge to our churches. It is in this area that returning chaplains will have one of their greatest opportunities for service, in helping to bridge the gap in understanding.

Serious trouble may develop between returning veterans and organized labor. The labor movement has become stronger during the war and, during the recent elections for the first time has shown a self-conscious and effective political influence. On the other hand, there are signs of resentment in the armed forces over

labor's share in the war boom, and over occasional strikes, which, though small compared with pre-war years, have been played up in the newspapers. It is possible, however, that the danger of post-war tensions between veterans and organized labor will be less than is feared, since so many service men come from the ranks of labor.

Racial tensions will call for the best efforts of religious groups. During the war, Negro organizations have strengthened their demand for greater equality of rights as well as obligations, and competition for post-war jobs may well evoke new frictions. The virus of anti-Semitism is still at work, and, in case of post-war reaction, could become virulent. The relocation of Japanese-Americans is fraught with economic and social tensions. All these issues of just social relations have to be taken into account by religious strategy.

While the social tasks of the churches are necessarily in the forefront of their attention, this does not imply that the primary task and main contribution of the churches is given secondary importance. On the contrary, there is a wide realization that better social relationships have their finest and ultimate sanction in better relations with God. The First Commandment precedes and reinforces the Second. The churches can be effective in their social work only insofar as their whole life and message offer a convincing witness to the reality of their faith.

Our Congregational Christian churches in General Council last June adopted unanimously a statement on "The Churches and the Post-War World", presenting ten goals for today and tomorrow among our churches and denominational agencies. The statement urged support for international organization, aid to devastated areas, efforts to secure an international bill of rights, greater cooperation with churches abroad, a program of Christian vocational training, a program to promote fellowship within the community, support for voluntary and government planning for demobilization and higher standards of living, and training in Christian citizenship. The committee set up to help the churches to carry through these objectives has rightly stressed the immediate urgency of effective support for international organization. Yet the two objectives placed before the eight goals mentioned above are the need for religious rebirth and more adequate education in the Christian faith. As the General Council stated:

> Men need ever more urgently a Sanctuary where they may experience the wholeness and true direction of life, a Covenant which sends them forth into creative work, a Communion which binds them together in a world-wide fellowship. These are the mission of our congregations.

Another of these ten goals is particularly important for British

and American churchmen to consider together. The General Council statement reads as follows:

> In order to serve God and man more effectively and to present the Gospel more convincingly, our Christian churches must realize more clearly than ever, the need for spiritual unity and ecumenical cooperation. We need to strengthen fellowship with churches of our faith and order in other countries. We need to cooperate with members of all faiths who share our convictions on moral principles. Particularly, do we need to develop all possible aid to and cooperation with the Younger Churches, in China, India and other mission lands. Their task of bringing the Good News to the people and of applying it to education and social reconstruction is an insistent call upon our best efforts. In close consultation with their leaders, we should help to furnish literature, equipment and specially trained personnel, to serve our common cause.

If our churches are to make their finest contribution to the world after victory, if they are really to help "hold the world together, as the soul holds the body", they can only do so through a world-wide strategy and fellowship. Isolated churches are as anachronistic as isolated countries. To generate their full power, our churches need to reinforce each other, to share ideas and problems, from time to time to initiate simultaneous and parallel efforts, and above all to develop a sense of the oneness of our common calling.

The death of the Archbishop of Canterbury was a grievous blow to the world strategy and strength we so greatly need. Yet his unfinished work should gird our mutual determination to build the cooperation of our churches, through the World Council of Churches, the International Missionary Council, the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, our own International Congregational Council, through every available channel. The needs of a suffering humanity require that the Christian churches arm themselves with the spiritual power of unity.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS

The tendency to project on others our own moral judgments is, perhaps, the most important single cause of international misunderstanding. We feel that the foreigner who does something of which we do not approve must know he is doing wrong and therefore is a criminal, or else, if he threatens to do such things, he must be bluffing—because of course he is a decent chap and would not really do any such thing. That was our attitude to the Germans prior to both the last and the present wars. Similarly, to the Germans the British are hypocrites because they profess to feel respon-

sibility for the welfare of savages, to be interested in the elevation of subject races or the spread of self-government. As imperialism is for the Germans sheer acquisitiveness, he assumes that other peoples cannot be sincere missionaries as well as traders. . . . The objective foreign observer realizes that in this country only the minority is vociferous, or, very often, even vocal. So when a handful of Oxford undergraduates vote they will not fight for King and country, he is not impressed. But the subjective foreign observer, who is in the overpowering majority, evaluating this journalistic tit-bit according to the meaning it would have in his country, where political expression is governmentally controlled, concludes that the rising generation will not fight. When it does fight, Albion has been perfidious again, and once more English hypocrisy has worked its ruse successfully.

J. T. MacCurdy, *Germany, Russia and the Future.*

. . . in explaining why the Conservatives in general remained so ignorant of the implications of the League, I am not seeking in any way to excuse them. The League method was the policy of our State. Until it was abandoned formally by us, it was our duty to take it seriously. If it was vague, foolish, idealistic, it should have been replaced by a sensible policy. If it was supported by all the fools and cranks in the country, then sensible men should not only have suspected it but renounced it. The explanation is that the Conservatives would have been ruined electorally if they had denounced the League. They would have suffered a crushing defeat, another 1906, and that would have been followed by "national ruin". To that I can only reply that we have had a good deal more of national ruin than any Socialist Government was likely to bring us. The Conservatives won their electoral victories. They did not avert war, they have not averted Socialism, and now they are daily swallowing doses of it that would ten years ago have driven them to a fascist revolution. This cynical, feebly machiavellian policy of clinging to power on terms that are neither honest nor honourable, accepting a present immunity from evil, looking only to the immediate future, saying things that you do not believe and binding yourself not to do that which you think is right, all such cowardly evasions bring their own revenge.

R. B. McCallum, *Public Opinion and the Last Peace.*

But why "profitless" and "impossible"? The doctrine of the Trinity is not a mystery handed down by God through clouds and thunderbolts. It was constructed by the mind of man. The stages of its construction can be historically verified. It is as much a human construction as the philosophic systems of Descartes and Kant. If there is any reason why speculation upon it is profitless, then it is because speculation cannot make head or tail of it. It is sheer obscurantism to say that at a certain point in the discussion of a thought-system created by the mind of man all inquiry must cease. Again and again Dr. Whale allies himself to the war-time method in current, orthodox theology of abandoning reason and argument for personal protestation and affirmation. The nature of God may indeed be called a mystery, but only in the sense that it invites more and more human inquiry, and promises more and more satisfaction. But to affirm that thus far and no further shall human reason go is to throw over one of the most precious achievements of modernity. It is a flight to the past, and, of course, not to the best in the past.

E. George Lee, *C. S. Lewis and Some Modern Theologians.*

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

CO-OPERATION IN MINISTERIAL TRAINING.

As a result of discussion at the Council of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in March, 1943, the following letter was sent to over 50 Colleges:

> The Council of the Congregational Union of England and Wales is deeply concerned about the training of the ministry after the war. Steps are being taken in common with other denominations to deal with the immediate post-war situation, but the opinion that the time has come when the churches should together face the whole problem has been freely expressed. It is urged that the present system of training goes back to days when means of transport and communication were poor, when there were no modern universities, and when the feeling between the churches was by no means so friendly as it is to-day. Is it possible to express the unity of the churches and at the same time use—and help—the modern universities by co-operation in ministerial training? Is it possible for example to establish in every university a college for ministerial training similar to the Union Theological Seminary, New York, where students of sixteen denominations, episcopal and non-episcopal, have the advantage of mutual interchange of view and of teaching by the best scholars in their respective fields? Could such a system be combined with a year of seminary life, where students could be taught the distinctive tenets of their denominations and receive there what might be missed in the larger institution? This suggestion is made only as one illustration of many ways in which co-operation might be possible between the theological colleges, both with one another, and with the local university: co-operation, of course, which already exists in some centres.
>
> There are about sixty institutions for training the ministry in the Church of England and the Free Churches, with a great variety in regulations for admission, exit, and length of training. It should be of service to discover the facts and tabulate them as far as possible, even if no such plan as is suggested is found feasible. If, however, the churches do find they can co-operate in ministerial training, it may prove an important factor both in the relations between them and in the effectiveness of their witness to the world.
>
> The first requisite in approaching suggestions of this nature is to

discover the facts, and the Council has appointed a small fact-finding Committee to endeavour to ascertain them. Once these are established it should be possible to place them before the different Communions. We should be grateful therefore if you would assist us by answering the questions below, and by furnishing such other information as you deem relevant.

1. What is the relationship of your College to other Theological Colleges and to any University in the vicinity? Does the University make any provision itself for training in Divinity?
2. What are the conditions of entrance, exit and length of training? And your average number of students in peace-time?
3. Have you any developments under consideration—not so much for the immediate post-war problems, but more permanently?

A summary of their replies was submitted to the Council in March, 1944, when it was resolved that they should be referred to the British Council of Churches, together with further replies from University representatives. The Dean of St. Paul's, Profs. C. H. Dodd, E. O. James, and T. W. Manson have been good enough to allow their comments to be printed, though it ought to be said that they were written without any thought of publication. They add important data from those who have had special opportunities for studying the problem.

I. From the Dean of St. Paul's, the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., D.D., D.Litt. Formerly Professor of the Philosophy of Religion, King's College, London.

I gladly respond to your invitation to comment on the possible development of co-operation between Theological Colleges.

My own experience is confined to the University of London, where special circumstances exist which I think do not obtain anywhere else. Co-operation between Theological teachers of different denominations is, in one respect, far advanced. The University Faculty, which controls the examinations and curricula for the divinity degrees, has always worked, in my experience, with remarkable harmony, and any differences of opinion which have arisen have been concerned with educational questions rather than denominational differences, *e.g.*, the matter of compulsory Hebrew. In respect of co-operation in teaching, very little has been done, but this is due mainly to the distance between the various colleges. What inter-collegiate teaching exists is almost entirely confined to post-graduate study. I do not see any possibility of extending inter-collegiate teaching so long as the colleges remain so far apart. If it were possible geographically, I think there would be no objection to common lectures in most of the theological subjects. I believe that the next practical step towards greater coherence in the Theological Faculty is to urge the University to found University Chairs in some of the main subjects and to pay the professors out of University funds. There is no reason why this should not be done, and combined representation by all the colleges would, I think, have considerable influence on the Senate and the Court. If I may say so, movements in this direction in the past have been rendered ineffective partly by reason of scruples which some Congregationalists appear to entertain about accepting money from the State for theological purposes. I should hope that this point of view would not now prevail.

I do not think that a Union Seminary on the lines of that in New York is either practicable or desirable. It is not practicable, because it is very doubtful whether most of the Anglican Bishops would accept men from such a college for Ordination. It is certain that most of them would

require students from such a college to have a further period of training in a definitely Anglican institution. It is not, in my opinion, desirable because unfortunately the traditions of worship and of training in the spiritual life are widely different, and I believe that Theology divorced from worship is most dangerous. I have had the great privilege of spending some time at the Union Theological Seminary for which, in many respects, I have the very highest admiration, but I felt that the corporate worship there was the weakest side and certainly it was not of the kind which would come naturally to a young man trained in the Anglican tradition. I suppose, inevitably, in such circumstances the worship must represent the highest common factor of the various denominations. I believe that the true line of advance is that we should develop on the best possible methods our own devotional inheritance, while joining together occasionally in such common worship as is possible for us without compromise of what we have come to believe to be valuable.

To sum up, I suggest that the beginning already made with co-operation in the study and teaching of theology can be enlarged; and in places which do not suffer the disadvantages of London, there seems to be no reason why many of the subjects should not be taught by professors and lecturers who are appointed by the University and whose lectures are attended by students of all kinds.

I think that any attempt to set up a Union College would be a failure so far as the Anglican Communion is concerned, but, at the same time, I wish that there were greater opportunity for more theological students to have a first-hand acquaintance with Christian traditions and worship other than their own. This end can be best attained, in my opinion, by the existence of colleges representing all that is best in their own denominations and ready to welcome students from other colleges to their services and discussions.

II. From Prof. C. H. Dodd, M.A., D.D. Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

You have been good enough to ask for comments upon the report of the sub-committee on co-operation with colleges of other denominations for the training of the ministry.

I must say at once that, having had experience of teaching in three interdenominational faculties of theology, at three different universities, I have no doubt whatever about the benefits of interdenominational co-operation in the training of the ministry; and no doubt about the advantages, both to the universities and to the theological colleges and their students, of the residence of men in a university during their period of training.

There are two separate points here. First, there is the question of the connection of theological colleges with a university. Most people in most denominations now recognize the value of a university education for their prospective ministers, at *some* stage. Where people differ is on the point of the advantages and disadvantages of reading *theology* in a university, as against reading it at a seminary. I am not unaware of the valid objections which are raised. It is said (and not altogether without truth) that the academic approach to the subject, which usually tends to a narrowly historical, critical, and (so far as may be) detached attitude to matters of faith, makes a separation in men's minds between their religion and their theology, and either leads them to a barren intellectualism or destroys all their interest, and leaves them with the impression that theology is irrelevant to true religion. The remedy for this lies largely with the theological colleges themselves; for if a man resides in a theological college during his period of

theological study in a university, it should be possible for the two atmospheres to interpenetrate to the enrichment of both. Precisely the wrong attitude is that which was expressed to me by a principal of a denominational college, who explained that he did not encourage his men to attend university lectures, because some years ago two men who had done so had "lost their faith". If a man's faith is not robust enough to stand up to scientific and critical questioning, it is far better that he should discover this before the end of his training than that he should go into the ministry without ever having had his faith thus tested. The pursuit of theological studies in an academic atmosphere of intellectual stringency, where theology has to find its place alongside other sciences, should give ministerial students a better chance of being equipped to meet the situation they will have to face when *militantes in saeculo*. And I am thinking here not only of attending lectures and the like, but of living among students of the secular faculties, not only at the "Arts" stage, but while actually studying theology.

The case is, to my mind, strengthened by recent developments in the theological scene. There is in process a welcome revival of theology in the grand manner—*theology* as distinct from mere history of doctrine, or psychology of religious experience, theology in the tradition of Origen, Augustine, Aquinas, and Calvin. But this carries with it a danger, especially where continental influences are predominant: that of the obscurantism which separates dogmatic theology from philosophy, or *"Weltanschauung"*. Our British tradition, both in the older Nonconformity and in the Church of England, has happily been in the main free from this tendency. Theology has been cultivated in close association with humane studies, and in particular with philosophy. The influence of the Christian Platonists has been felt both in Puritan and in "Catholic" circles for three centuries. It is important to reassert this influence. The Church will not be able to speak with its enemies in the gate unless its teachers are in touch with other disciplines, both humane and scientific, and unless their intellectual outlook and grasp are cultivated and tested in the equal intercourse of the *respublica litterarum*. And I believe this is no less important for the universities themselves. Academic studies are impoverished if theology is withdrawn. In the newer universities the only chance of developing theological faculties is through the co-operation of theological colleges. Moreover, the general position of philosophical studies in this country is such that, in my opinion, the immediate hope of sound and fruitful philosophical thinking and teaching in the universities depends largely upon theologians with the *philosophia perennis* as their background.

So much for the first point. The second, closely bound up with it, but not the same question, is that of co-operation among the denominational colleges themselves—as for instance the institution of "union seminaries" more or less on the New York model. The position as I see it is this. Our denominational differences are now largely extra-theological, and theological differences cut sharply across denominational distinctions. For both reasons theology stands to gain by being pursued interdenominationally. From the other side, the urgent need for economy in the use of our man-power and financial resources points to some measure of fusion of colleges. On the other hand, it is important that ministerial students should during their theological training be effectively in touch with the whole practice of the religious life in sacrament, preaching, cure of souls, congregational fellowship, and corporate discipline. As things are, however much we may regret the fact (and for myself I do regret it), this practice is bound up with denominations. It will therefore be necessary to take thought that any fusion which is proposed will not result in turning out young ministers who

have only a generalized and not a specific association with the Church as a going concern. Again, it is important that the idea of "union seminaries" should not overshadow the idea of joint faculties in universities. There is in this country some experience to show that the grouping of denominational colleges, without attachment to a university, does not tend to dispel the "seminarist" atmosphere: still less would their fusion into a single institution do so. Union Seminary, New York, is in a somewhat peculiar position, upon which I need not enlarge. But I doubt whether American precedents are very relevant to our situation.

My idea would be that in any combination of theological colleges that may be contemplated in the near future the position should be regarded from the point of view of interdenominational co-operation within the framework of university faculties of theology. The staffing of the colleges should be considered in relation to the provision of a comprehensive and balanced body of teachers, while each contributing denomination would also estimate its own needs for what may be called "intra-denominational" concerns.

One matter that always causes some measure of difficulty is the difference of opinion about the place which the academic study of theological subjects should take in the course of preparation for the Ministry. In some quarters theology is regarded as essentially a post-graduate discipline. Students read first for an Arts degree, in one of the usual secular subjects, and then pass on to theology. In other quarters it is thought proper for men to read theology for their "Arts" course. Their post-graduate studies are then largely "vocational" in the narrower sense, and such as to be properly pursued in a seminary. In all three universities with which I am best acquainted this leads to some anomalies in the co-ordinating of the studies of university and seminary. I don't look forward to any *Gleichschaltung* in this respect in the near future, but those responsible for any rearrangement of theological training should be aware of the problem.

It looks as if in the near future most of the Church of England seminaries would move into universities. Nonconformist colleges have been for some time tending in the same direction, and I believe that is the direction in which we ought to move. There is no prospect, in any future to which we can properly look forward in practical politics, of establishing joint Anglican and Free Church seminaries, but there is no hindrance whatever to immediate co-operation in faculty teaching. There may be some Nonconformist colleges which are already so closely akin in tradition and method that virtually complete fusion of their staffs could take place with advantage. In general, I should judge that something like denominational hostels, with their own corporate practice of their particular denominational discipline, and with teaching staffs of which some members would also become university teachers, represent the most likely and practical development. I would add that it would be a mistake for every denomination to wish to be represented everywhere.

Two further suggestions I would offer. First, when denominational colleges plant themselves in a university, steps should be taken to ensure that both the students on the one hand and the university on the other profit fully by the association. I know cases where this ideal is very largely realized. I know other cases where topographical propinquity leaves the institutions almost completely indifferent to one another. That is quite futile. There is no point in bringing (say) a Congregational college to a university to be a stronghold of Congregationalism *in partibus infidelium*. The students of the college should attend university lectures, and the teachers of the college should lecture in the university; and to this end both must be prepared for the necessary give-and-take.

Secondly, I think the time has come when our own denomination, and other Nonconformist denominations, or preferably the Free Church body as a whole, should consider what can be done to provide Nonconformist students with more opportunities for such "research", or advanced study, in theology as is necessary if a man is to qualify ultimately for university teaching, such study to be pursued within the university. As things are at present, there is ample opportunity for Nonconformists to take their place in university faculties as fully accredited teachers—when once they have proved their competence. But we have not sufficient ways (as compared with the C. of E.) of giving men the chance to make themselves competent. I suggest that while we are making provision for teaching our future ministers, we should also give thought to the producing of future teachers of ministers. We have some provision, but not enough. All who are concerned with the filling of vacant teaching posts know how difficult it is becoming to find qualified men, particularly in the more specialized departments of the theological discipline, and the problem will not grow easier in the immediate future.

III. From Prof. E. O. James, M.A., D.Litt., D.D. Professor of History and Philosophy of Religion, University of Leeds.

In reply to your letter regarding my experience of co-operation between Theological Colleges and Universities, the experiment at Leeds has shown, I think, that it is desirable that the University should have an adequately staffed Theological Faculty. We began by trying to inaugurate divinity degrees relying upon the colleges in the district to supply the greater part of the teaching; this arrangement has proved to be impracticable for a number of reasons. A university of necessity must approach the study of theology from an academic standpoint irrespective of any denominational loyalties and pre-suppositions. It must also make provision for the instruction of all students, whether members of a theological college or not, capable of matriculation, and arrange its time-table in relation to the general work of the university in all its faculties, keeping of course the same terms. A Theological College, on the other hand, exists primarily for the vocational training of clergy and ministers of a particular denomination with the consequential dogmatic background both as regards the study of theology and the practice of religion. Therefore, since the two institutions are designed for different purposes, the one cannot be a *substitute* for the other. But they can and should be supplementary and work in co-operation with each other.

The ideal arrangement in my opinion would be for the majority of ordinands or prospective ministers to spend the first part of their period of preparation in a university reading for either a degree in Arts which includes some theological subjects (or in the case of those students who have had a liberal education and cultured upbringing, a degree in theology), to leave more time for vocational training in their Theological College, which would constitute the second section of their preparation. Where it is possible, as in the ancient universities, to stay up for a fourth year to read a second School or a Diploma in Theology, this I have found to be most beneficial, especially as a maturer mind is brought to bear upon the course. This clear-cut division into academic and vocational (including of course devotional) training is not always possible, and indeed in some instances is not desirable. If Theological Colleges were established in University centres, a greater elasticity could be effected as and when required, with a considerable measure of co-operation between the staffs of both institutions. For example, *O.T.* and *N.T.* Language, History and Literature, Philosophy of

Religion, and the Comparative Study of Religion together with certain aspects of Church History might be wholly or in part taken at the University, thereby leaving the Theological Colleges more time for instruction in systematic theology, *pastoralia*, Christian ethics (or moral theology), the devotional and dogmatic aspects of Biblical studies, and all the other things a priest or pastor should know and believe. In the case of non-graduates attendance at the University for courses in subjects not taught in the Theological Colleges (*e.g.*, general psychology, philosophy, social science, teaching methods, *etc.*, in all of which Universities should be better equipped in expert staff than a college) would broaden the basis of the curriculum and provide contacts with a wider cultural *milieu*. Conversely, undergraduates and the teaching staff of a university would benefit by more intimate association with the colleges and their members, especially in institutions of the "Redbrick" type where the applied sciences predominate.

I have long felt that in or near one of the great academic centres (*e.g.*, Oxford, Cambridge, or possibly London) it would be of inestimable benefit to establish something remotely resembling Union Seminary, New York, in which the staff would be interdenominational and the students not confined to "ordinands". The institution would become not only a place for the training of clergy and ministers in certain subjects, but also a centre of theological research and post-graduate study, equipped with a first-rate library and a staff of scholars of recognized eminence in their own subjects. It would combine the features of a Theological Faculty and, let us say, the Rylands Library and St. Deiniol's, Hawarden, and to it parish priests, pastors, missionaries on furlough (and those preparing for work overseas) would resort for refresher courses, research, and specialized training not usually provided either in universities or Theological Colleges. A proposal to set up a "Central College" for the Anglican Communion was, I believe, to have been suggested at the Lambeth Conference in 1940, and such an institution might well have a wider reference if it were situated in close proximity to an important university centre. As things are at present it would be hardly possible to extend the scheme to all the universities, but I am convinced that the experiment would be well worth while at a place like Oxford or Cambridge where the existing resources could be utilized and supplemented as and when required. I have often thought the buildings now occupied by Ripon Hall on Boar's Hill would make an excellent home for such an institution. But these are merely suggestions.

IV. From Prof. T. W. Manson, M.A., D.D., D.Litt. Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis, University of Manchester.

(1) From the foundation of the Faculty of Theology here there has been close and intimate contact between the University and the seven Colleges representing six Churches (Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, Moravian, and Unitarian). College teachers have been appointed as University teachers (part-time). All Colleges have had direct representation on the Faculty Board. There has been a great deal of inter-College co-operation in the matter of admission to one another's courses. Each College has maintained its own domestic and devotional life.

(2) The greatest harmony has prevailed in the Faculty. This I attribute to three main causes:

(a) No theological tests whatever for teachers or taught, imposed by the University (what the Churches impose on their own ordinands is *their* affair, not ours).

(b) No question allowed in University examinations which would require the candidate to declare his personal religious convictions. All

examination papers are checked by a special Committee to ensure that this rule is observed in letter and spirit.

(c) The University does not teach Doctrine. This is done in the Colleges. History of Doctrine (*not* Systematic Theology) is a compulsory subject in the University examinations (B.D. and Certificate in Theology); but the subject is treated as *History*.

These safeguards plus good sense, courtesy, and charity, have made the Faculty a thoroughly harmonious body, doing its work efficiently and smoothly.

(3) The University already makes considerable provision for the teaching in the main departments of Theological study, other than History of Doctrine. It may do more in the future. But whatever it does, it is most desirable that the Colleges should continue to be well represented in the teaching work, so that the collaboration of University and Colleges may be as close and effective as possible.

(4) Future developments will, I hope, be on the lines of enlarging the facilities already existing. At present we have the B.D., which normally requires a previous degree in another Faculty. The standard is high, and consequently the degree is out of reach of all except the ablest men in the Colleges. The Certificate in Theology, which is the alternative, is a good qualification, within the reach of any good candidate for the ministry; but it is not a degree. I think what is needed here is a degree (a B.A. with a good deal of Theology in it) that can be taken as a first degree in three years. I hope to see such a degree brought into existence. I believe it would enlarge the field of fruitful co-operation and mutual benefit for both University and Colleges.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

We hope that a more convincing reply to Dr. C. E. M. Joad is possible than the Bishop of Gloucester's Open Letter, *Why I Am Satisfied* (Blackwell, 2s. 6d.). Prof. Leonard Hodgson's *Theology in an Age of Science* (Oxford Press, 2s.) is an Inaugural Lecture. Two informing Triple Jubilee Papers are the Rev. A. J. Haile's *Education in a Modern Mission* and Miss Joyce Rutherford's *The Place of Women in Missionary Work* (Livingstone House, 4d. each). *Christianity as an Interpretation of History* (Longmans, 1s.) is the late Dr. Temple's Ainslie Memorial Lecture. The Lindsey Press begins a new series, "Religion in a Changing World" (6d.), in which "Unitarians State Their Faith". The first three issues are the Rev. R. V. Holt's *Changing Moral Standards*, the Rev. E. G. Lee's *C. S. Lewis and Some Modern Theologians*, and the Rev. Leslie J. Belton's *Religion and the Scientists*. Sir Frederic Kenyon's *Religion and National Life* (S.P.C.K., 1s.) acutely describes modern life, and finds its needs in Bible reading, public worship, and religious education. The British Academy appreciation of Edwyn Robert Bevan, 1870-1943 (Oxford Press, 2s.) is by "G.M." In *The Inward Journey of Isaac Penington* (Friends' Book Centre, 1s.) Mr. R. J. Leach has skilfully summarized the 1,400 pages of Penington's spiritual writings. The P.E.P. pamphlet, *Are Refugees an Asset?* (1s.), after stating the facts, answers the question of its title in the affirmative. Three new "Oxford Pamphlets" (6d.) are Mrs. D. M. Pickles's *France*, Sir George Sansom's *Japan*, and Miss M. Bowley's *Britain's Housing Shortage*. Lord Eustace Percy's Riddell Lectures, *The Unknown State* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.), are "A Plea for the Study of Government": like all that Lord Eustace writes, they are deserving of careful study. Mr. H. A. Taylor's *Freedom No. 1* (Signpost Press, 1s.) is an informing discussion of the British Press, marred by an irrelevant gibe at Sir Richard Acland. We agree with Mr. Isaac Foot that Oliver Cromwell and Abraham Lincoln are the outstanding figures in their respective countries, and we welcome his comparison, *Oliver Cromwell and Abraham Lincoln* (R.S.L., 2s. 6d.), to which Dr. G. P. Gooch contributes a Foreword.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS

PICKED IN BYPATH MEADOW

FROM THE ELLESMERE MANUSCRIPTS IN THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY.

ONE of the major temptations of the student is to stray from the main track of his appointed research and wander in adjacent fields. It is a temptation by no means easy to resist, and almost impossible when one is handling a collection of manuscripts as varied and fascinating as the Ellesmere Collection. Certainly I have found it beyond my power to plod along the Elizabethan highway without stopping to gaze over the hedges, and sometimes even jumping the stiles from which lead enticing paths across the seventeenth-century landscape.

Here then are some of the flowers picked by a sixteenth-century student in bypath meadow, tied only by a chronological string. The bouquet is presented in fear and trembling, for some of the flowers, quite new to him, may be entirely familiar to those well acquainted with the literature of the first half of the seventeenth century: it is difficult for a trespasser to know at a glance if a ballad, recipe, or marvel has been already printed: C. H. Firth would have known at once, of course, but there has been only one C. H. Firth. It is quite likely, however, that some readers may be able to report where some of these items are to be found and to give them more exact dates. Many of them are taken from volumes of the Collection containing copies rather than originals, and that makes it all the more likely that they do not see the light here for the first time: there are, *e.g.*, several ballads not printed here which appear in *Rump Songs*[1].

The selection illustrates not only different forms used during the period, but also its varied interests. The common contractions for "the", "pre", and final "m" or "n" are run out.

* * *

First come two anagram poems. One, on "Elisabeth Stewart" (*z* is an awkward letter for anagrams), is of value not merely because there are few ballads dealing with the Bohemian episode, but because of its claim that the English Church, through Wyclif, *via* Huss, is the mother of the Reformed Churches of the Continent. The other, while not so finished, is of interest for the way its conception is worked out, and for its reference to America ("A merry K").

Ellesmere 8803. Elisabeth Stewart Annagr. I see that war blest[2].

When Popish pollicie the truth concealed
and drown'd the world in darkness, there did rise
In England first that true light which reveald
the glorious ghospelles to all christian eyes
Wickliffe did first raise truth out of her tombe
& blazed th'impostures of the Courte of Rome
England began, *Bohemia* followed after
& by this happie meane tooke light from us:
Our second *Richard* married hence a daughter
With whome (its thought) came *Jerome* & *John Husse*
Some clarkes there came who truth in England found
and after sowed it in *Bohemia* ground.

[1] "an Exact Collection of the Choysest Poems and Songs relating to the Late Times" (London, 1662), generally referred to by the running title, *Rump Songs*.

[2] Anagram of "Elisabeth Stewart", Princess Royal of England, Queen of Bohemia, married 1613.

There like a graine of mustard seed it grew
& though that *John* and *Jerome* burned were
Yet from the cinders of those Martyrs true
the truth did spring & spread both farre & neare
Soe god is pleasd sometimes to burne his field
that soe it may the better harvest yeld.

Thus may our Church the mother Church be stild
of those reformed German Churches all
Of the *Bohemian* Church her eldest Childe
and lastly this may be observed with all
theire Queene sent us, the truth to them did gaine
Our Queene wee send them, will that truth maintaine.

Ellesmere 8839 is "Parliament"

Anagr A Map it rent (the anagram is faulty)
Endorsed "England's the World, etc."

England's the World, the Epitome or Map
is the Parliament, but oh unlucky hap!
A Map it rent, just as wee may behold
sometime the greate worlde in a Map that's old;
'Twas once a good one, but now nought the same,
scarce worth the hanging up, quite out of frame.
A map it rent, And yet not so rent nether
but that it may be reade, where 't hangs together
Here may you see Newe England; And by th'waye
some such odd peices of A merry K
Nothing of Europe, but a Towne of fame,
A Babell building of old Amsterdame.
Famous for this, where sinne, or anythinge
maye bee endured, but one Churche, on[e] Kinge
The Arke once landed here, but at this Haven
they sent the Dove backe, and tooke in the Raven.
But what is here? oh 'tis pitty; Nowe some good people
would [? hold] these twoo Peices up; oh 'tis a steeple.
Here was a Churche; oh that I had some Plasters
to mend this map; 'tis a Madd world my Masters.

Next comes a poem of the "Echo" *genre,* with some very clever lines[3]. Endorsed "Eccho", it is Ellesmere 8839:

Ellesmere 8839	Endorsed "Eccho"
Name (Echo) who this new Religion grounded	*Roundhead*
Who are professors most considerable	*Rable*
How do they proue themselfes to bee the Godly ...	*Odlie*
Yett they are knowne in life to bee most holy	*O lie*
Who are their common preachers men or women ...	*Women*
Came they from any University	*Cittie*
I'st not absurdity that they deliuer	*Euer*
But still their ayme is for to edefie	*Ah fie*
What do you call it there to fructifie	*Uctifie*
What Churches do they teach in & what Pulpitts ...	*Pitts*

[3] With this may be compared "An Eccho: London, sad London", a much shorter and duller effort, printed in *Rump Songs,* I, 86-7, a version of which is to be found in Ellesmere 8757.

But do they not in Chambers conventicle	*Tickle*
But sure their holy sisters are belied	*Belied*
The Godly members soone will condescend	*End*
As your Churches they in zeale imbrace them	*Race them*
What do they make our Bpps Hierarchie	*Archie*
Are Crosses reuerence or ornamentes their scandall ...	*All*
Nor will they leaue us any Ceremonies	*Monies*
Must euen Religion downe for satisfacion	*Faction*
How stand they affected to the Gouerment Civill ...	*Evill*
What would they shew to have us still forsaking ...	*A Kinge*
Tush, to the Kinge they say they are most Loyall ...	*Lie all*
What will they bring us to the Parlament	*Lament*
Cannot the Kinge prevent them by Prorogues	*O Rogues*
Nay Rayle not thus there are better things a brewinge	*Ruine*
They now distroy men by their Proclamacions	*Nations*
Nor are they paynted Tombes on guilded Evells ...	*Devills*
Unles they meete a Checke then all must Rue	*Most true*
Then God keepe Church & State from these same men	*Amen*

Some Civil War ballads follow, all of them anti-Parliament. Ellesmere 8841 (another copy Ellesmere 8875), endorsed "Pym and his faction" (to the tune "Philliday flouts me") reads:

I meane to feare the King
with all my power
& wishe noe other thing
but Bpps from Tower
If Pim but knewe my minde & my intencion
I should to Newegate goe wthout prevention
Where I might fast & pray
many a night & Day
cause I will not obey
Pim & his faction

The Croppes have sworne wee all
shall be out rooted
When they came to Whitehall
Lord, how they showted
Saying that soules . . . was in exclamation[4]
Saying that Bpps Gownes were out of fashion
Weauers to them shall preach
Coblers to them shall teach
Cause they'le not make a breach
of Pim and his faction

If he but say the word
they will adore it
If hee adjourne Parlemt
they will adjourne it
Hee is a zealous man & a true brother
The holy sisters approve of none other
hee's holy in his waies,
hee seldome fasts, but prayes,
calling them back that strayes
from hym & his faction

[4] "soules" written in later, dots as in MS., "were" written in later above "was". In several places corrections by a later hand.

Then will wee up & drawe
to a Conclusion
Keeping myself in awe
from their delusion
So may I feare my King as a trew master
& learne to hate your Pim so much the faster
& wish vnto all those
that to the statue bowes
a face without a Nose
Pim & his faction

Here is "Change Places Charles" (Ellesmere 8809).

Change places Charles, put thou on Pym's grave gowne,
Since in the Lower house he weares the Crowne,
Let him be King a while, & be thou Pym
Then wee'le adore thee as we nowe doe him,
Put downe the Prelates which so proud'ly strive
T'advance their owne, & thy Prerogative,
And be content since most of them are Romans
To have some Traytors in the house of Commons
Let us doe what wee list, & thou shalt see
Wee'le all be Kings, as well as Pym & Thee.

This is preceded by[5]:

Wee fasted first, then prayed that warres might cease
When Prayers woulde not serve wee Payde for Peace
And gladde wee had it so, & gave God thankes
Which tought the Irish *learne* the Scotish Prankes.
Is there no God? Lett's put it to the vote
Is there no Churche? Some fooles say *no*, by rote.
Is there no King but Pym to *geue consent*
To what is done by act of Parliament
No God? No Churche? No King? then all *is* well
If they coulde but enacte there were no Hell.

Compare Ellesmere 8807: An answere to the verses; Is ther no God

Is there noe God? lett it be put to vote
Is there noe Kinge but Pym, as some men dote
Is there noe Church, bee't soe, wee are content
So it bee done by Acte of Parliament
Is there noe God, noe Kinge, noe Church, tis well
If they can finde at last there is noe Hell

Is there a God? Why doe the Commons foole
Is there a Kinge? Why then do's Pym beare rule
Is there a Church? Why are ye members Rent
& not made up by Acte of Parliament
Is there a God, a Kinge, a Church, tis euen
As iust as they should enacte there is a Heaven
Unlesse that God, the Kinge, Church, Hell, Heaven, all
Like Strafforde by one Pym must stand, or fall.

[5] In *Rump Songs*, I. 64, as "The Rump's Hypocrisy", with minor differences; l. 4, *play* for *learne;* l. 6, *so* for *no;* l. 7, *for to assent* for *to geue consent;* l. 8, *What shall be done* for *To what is done;* l. 9, *were* for *is.*

Then, in another ink:

Is there no God? letts put it to the vote
Is there no Churche? so some haue learned by rote
Is there no King? hm, hm, it's our intent
To find that out by Acte of Parlement
No God? no Churche? no King? then all is well
Yf the Greate Counsell doe not finde a Hell

Ellesmere 8864 is an epitaph on Strafford, said to be in the hand of the first Earl of Bridgewater. This appears to be John Cleveland's; it is printed in Cleveland's *Poems* (ed. J. M. Berdan), p. 184, and in the *Oxford Book of 17th Century Verse*. There is a copy in the State Papers (*Calendar*, 1640-1, p. 574), which differs in places from the Ellesmere version. The *Oxford* version agrees with that of the State Papers (and in addition has in l. 5, "He spent his time here in a mist"): they have l. 1, *lies* for *rests;* l. 3, *hurried* for *bandyed;* l. 4, *Twixt* for *Tweene;* l. 5, *here* before *in a mist;* l. 8, *He* had for *Who* had.

Here rests wise & valiant dust
Huddled up twixt fitt & just,
Strafford: who was bandyed hence
Tweene Treason & Convenience
Who liv'd & dyed in a Mist
A Papist & a Calvinist
His Prince's nearest Joy & Greife
Who had, yet wanted, all releif
The Prop & Ruine of the State
The Peoples violent Loue and hate,
One in Extreames Loue'd & abhorred
Riddles Lye here; or in a word
Here lyes Blood, & let it lye
Speechelesse still & neuer Crye

Ellesmere 8865 is headed "Verses made upon the E. of Strafforde his empechement in Parlemt. 1640". This is printed with five more, and inferior, stanzas in Schelling, *Book of Seventeenth Century Lyrics*, 104-6, with the title, "Lord Strafford's Meditation in the Tower". It appeared as a broadsheet in 1641, and, without sufficient evidence, has been attributed to Strafford himself. In stanza 2, Schelling has *light* for *spight*, in 3 *upwards* for *towards it*, and in 4 the last lines read:

For number and clear light
Such as may soon o'erwhelme him quite
& blind them both in one dead night.

El. 8865: "Verses made upon the E. of Strafforde his empechement in Parlemt. 1640":

Goe emptie Joyes
with all your noise
And leaue me heare alone
In sweete sad silence to bemoane
poore ficklie [*sic*] woldlie [*sic*] height
Whose danger none can see aright
Whiles your false splendr dimmes the sight.

Goe & insnare
with your trimme ware
Some other easie Wight:
And cheate him with your flatring spight,
Raine on his head a Showre
Of honour, favour, Wealth, & Power,
then snatch it from him in an houre.

Fill his bigge minde
with gallant winde,
Of insolent applause:
Lett him not feare all curbing Lawes
Nor King, nor People's frowne
But dreame of something like a Crowne
& climbing towards it tumble downe.

Lett him appeare
in his bright spheare
Like Cinthia in her pride,
With Starrelike Troupes on euerie side,
Such for their Numbers and their light,
Till the same Cloudes orewhelme him quite,
& Blind us both in one Dead Night.

Ellesmere 8884 (another copy in Ellesmere 8890) is endorsed "The Tryumph of the Roundheads". For this see *Roxburghe Ballads*, IV. 260 ff. The original seems to have been written by Francis Quarles in 1641, and incorporated in *The Shepheard's Oracle* (1644) though it does not appear in the 1646 edition. Some verses were dropped, others were added later by Tom D'Urfey and another, and finally it appeared in 1682 as *The Whig Rampart*, which contains ten verses and is the version in the *Roxburghe Ballads*. Of the Ellesmere version, stanza 2 is Roxburghe 10, 4 is 5, 6 is 2, and 7 is 3, with significant changes. The other three Ellesmere stanzas are Quarles's, and they were dropped. For "Smects" see the page below.

The reioyceing of ye Smects or the Tryumph of the Roundheads

Know this my Brethren heaven is cleare
and all the clouds are gone
The righteous now shall florish, and
good dayes are coming on
Come then my Brethren, and be glad
and eke reioyce with mee
Lawne sleeues, and Rochetts shall goe downe
And hay, then up goe wee

Weele breake the windowes wch the whore
Of Babilon hath painted
And when the popishe saints are downe
then Burgess shalbe sainted
Theres neither Cross nor Crucifix
Shall stand for men to see
Romes trash and trumpery shall downe
and hay, etc.

What e're the Popish hands haue built
our Hammers shall vndoe
Weele break their pipes, and burne their Copes
and put down Churches too
weele exercise with in the groues
and teach beneath a Tree
weele make a Pulpitt of a Cart
and hay, &c.

Weele downe with all the uersities
where Learning is profest
because they practise and maintaine
the Language of the beast
Weele driue the Doctors out of doores
and Arts what ere they bee
Weele crye all Arts and learning downe
and hey, then up goe wee.

Weele downe with Deanes and Prebends too
and I reioyce to tell you
how that we will eate pigges our fill
and Capons by the Belly.
Weele burne the Fathers witty bookes
and make the Schoolemen flee
Weele downe with all that smells of witt
and hay, &c.

If once the Antichristian crew
be crewshed and ouerthrowne
Weele teache the Nobles how to crouch
and keepe the gentry downe
Good manners haue an ill report
and turnes to pride we see
Weele therefore Crye good manners down
and hay, &c.

The name of Lords shalbe abhor'd
for euery man's a Brother
No reason why in Church or State
one man should rule another
But when the change of gouerment
shall sett our fingers free
Weele make the wanton Sisters stoope
and hay then upp goe wee

In 1641 was published *Smectymnus,* the title being made up of the initials of the five authors, S. Marshall, E. Calamy, T. Young, M. Newcomen, W. Spurstow. The subtitle is "An answer to a Booke entituled *An Humble Remonstrance* (Bishop Hall), in which The Originall of Liturgy [and] Episcopacy is discussed. And Queries propounded concerning both. The Parity of Bishops and Presbyters in Scripture Demonstrated. The occasion of their Imparity in Antiquity discovered. The disparity of the Ancient and our Moderne Bishops manifested. The Antiquity of Ruling Elders in the Church vindicated. The Prelaticall Church Bounded". Here are two ballads about the "Smects"[6]:

[6] Cf. "Smectymnuus or The Club-Divines" (*Rump Songs,* I. 157 ff), also in Berdan, Poems of John Cleveland, 123-6.

Ellesmere 8774

S.M.E.C.T.Y.M.N.U.S.
vel
Belua multorum Capitum

And must you Conventicle in print your names
Wast not enough, that with the peacht eyed dames
You brake the Biskett, Reasons then put out light
Sentense the Laune sleeues, in the dead of night
for soe ith darke of ould the wiser Magi
Nodded life & death one Arropagi[?]
admitts no such Apocalipt, you may disclose
A five-headed beast, The mistery goes
as locks by secrett letters, and will ope
without the helpe of Keyes, An English ysope[7]
then letts disband S: M: oh Symon Magus
that devill which in the songe doth plague us
E: C: Edw. Cormorant he'll deuoure
fower wyddowes for a breakfast in an howre
T: Y: muakes faire for Tyborne, that was he
that served out 3 yeares in divinity
then tasted liquors and began to speake
& made wth ells of breath his Question [?] Reeke
& now he's of the Companie, his baul
fitts him for ye Charter preachers haull
M: N: oh Mr. nonsense, whoe can drawe
Sixteen propositions from (I sawe)
besides Ten Corolaries, but them he
like Eporus makes these Ten up thirty three
W: S: is Walter Spurgall, who ith pointe
of free will Checkt his right Arme out out Joynt
Whilst full of Rapture & of heate he feeles
it moue, as if the Jade had swallowed Eles
Then after dynner tought more with one hand
then all our learned Bpps. understand
but this I must confesse that he [?]
abated somewhat of effectually
These are the Lapp men of the Rout, the summ
of fifteene thousand schismes compendium
Bp. Hall The greate Goliah, by our dauieds slayne
whom the Phylistynnes Army did contayne
A lopp of Bryareus that fright the sky
& threatens to pull down the Hyrarchy
short hand sedicon, & the breife extracte
of worse conspiracy, then ere was rackt
Thus figures stand for millions & that one
greate devills more [nowe] cast out whose name is Legion
Compounded mischeife (to it selfe) a Charme
& poysons that are mixt shall work no harme

Catalogued under some Historical Notes (of no importance) No. 6196 is a striking poem with the title "Stycheborns Vearce". This is printed in the *Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse*, 229-30, as "Elegy" from *Verses of Praise and Joy*, 1586, a work we have not been able to examine.

[7] Æsop.

It is ascribed to Chidiock Tichborne, d. 1586. In the first stanza the *Oxford Book* has *good* for *age* and l. 5, *The* for *My;* in stanza 2, l. 5, *is* for *was;* in stanza 3 *sought* for *looked* in l. 1, *a* for *but* in l. 2, and *knew* for *sawe* in l. 3.

My pryme of youthe, is but a frost of Cares
My feaste of Joye is but a dyshe of payne
My croppe of Corne is but a feild of tares
And all my *age* is but vayne hope of gayne
My day is past, & yet I saw no sune
And now I lyve, & nowe my lyfe is done
My tale was hard[8], And yet it was not told
My frute is falne, & yet my leaves are greene
My youthe is spent & yet I ame not old
I sawe the world, & yet I was not seene
My threade is cutt, & yet it *was* not spune
And nowe I lyve, & nowe my lyfe is donne
I *loked* for deathe, And found it in my womb
I sought for lyfe, and Sawe it was *but* shade
I trod ye Earthe, and *sawe* it was my tombe
And nowe I die, and nowe I was but made
My glasse is full, & yet my glasse is run
And nowe I lyve, & nowe my lyfe is donne.

Ellesmere 8892 is a version of Campion's "Cherry Ripe", with the following differences from the customary text in the *Fourth Book of Airs*, No. VII, ed. 1612? (with music), the text used in the *Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse*, 842-3. ([10]) and ([11]) are distinct improvements on the printed version; ([12]) looks like a slip of the copyist. One wonders what Campion himself wrote; perhaps the textual critic can help. What is the significance of the last two lines, which do not appear in the 1612 edition?

There is a gardine in hir face
Where roses and white lillies growe,
A heauenlie paradise in that place
Wherin all pleasant frutes doe flowe.
There cheries growe which none maie bye,
Till cherie ripe, till cherie ripe, till cherie ripe,
Cherie ripe, ripe, ripe. cherie ripe, ripe, cherie ripe
them selues doe crye.

Those cheries fairelie doe enclose
Of orient pearle a doble rowe,
Which when hir louelie laughter showse
They looke lyke rose-buds fill'd with snowe
Yet them nor Prince nor Peere[9] maie buye
Til cherie ripe, et cet.

Hir eyes lyke angels guard them still,
Hir browes lyke bended bowes doe stand,
Threatning with pearcing darts[10] to kill
All that presume[11] with eare[12] or hand
Those sacred cheries to com nighe

[8] *I.e.*, heard. [9] *peere nor Prince* for *Prince nor Peere.* [10] *frowns* for *darts.* [11] *attempt* for *presume.* [12] *eye* for *eare.*

Till cherie ripe, et.
But oh, but oh the note
Of ayre aboue all ayres

No collection of this kind would be complete without copies of recipes, remedies, and cures[13]. Vol. 34, C. 5, 6 a *verso* contains remedies against deafness:

Mr. Malen[14]
Tak the Joyce of skarloe which growethe amongest Corne tak eleborus whit & scrape ther of with in iij days of the change of the moone & drawe it upp in to yor nose & it will mak you to sneze and helpethe the hearyng

doctor Turner[15] for hering
Tak the oyle of Butter almondes & put therunto 3 graynes of musk, also take Sevet & musk, & a stone piche[16] & temper them together mak ther of a tent & put it in the eare & tye a thread to the end therof.

Ellesmere 6163 is "An excellent salve for an ache":

Take towe spoonffull of an oxe gaule & towe spoonffull of neates foote oyle & one spoonffull of the best aqua vite put these three things into a peace & styrr them together the space of one quarter of an houre & it will be wrought thyck lyke to a salve with this at your going to bedd bathe the place wher youre ache is as warme as you may indure & lay warme Clothes upon it & so take your rest use this towe nyghts or three & you shall fynd ease by the grace of God. this hath prevaled when thyngs of grate price fayled

An example of the marvels dear to the age is found in Ellesmere 6174, which tells of appearances in the sky at Cockermouth, Cumberland. Perhaps the astrologists who still appear to flourish may be able to make more of this than can the historian, especially if he happen to be a prosaic Englishman. Robert Cawdry or Cawdrey was a Puritan often in trouble with the High Commission.

Marche the viij^{t} 1598

Over Cockermouthe in Comberland hathe apered suche wonderfull sayghts in the ayer as the lyk was never hard of, namly such fyerye workes so rare and strang(e), as hardly can be declared, wher out issued towe grete cyrcles of bloud to the amasment of all the beholders. Then from these ther marched in battell array towe huge and grete Armyes all in complete armor, withe Bowes and arrowes, halberdes, musketts and pikemen who met & fought for the space of an houre, And then was seene a myghtye man withe a bowe bent & so shott among them and overthrewe them all. Then came out of the East and Southe a wonderfull great troupe of horsmen, gallantly provyded who fought withe one man comyng out of the North a long tyme, tyll ther apeared a Rever of bloud wyche did seeme to separat them, and then apeared a grete navye of shipps of war who had lykwyse a grete feyght in the end dyvers of them wer seene to synk in these same Revers of bloud. And so it ended to the gret terror and amasment of all the

[13] A selection would make a fascinating volume.

[14] Probably James Molines (Moleyns or Mullins), d. 1639, surgeon. Member of Barber-Surgeons Company 1607; 1622-3 surgeon "for cutting of the stone" at St. Bartholomew's and St. Thomas's Hospitals. A noted surgeon. (*D.N.B.*)

[15] Probably Dr. Peter Turner, son of William Turner, Dean of Wells. (*D.N.B.*)

[16] *i.e.*, stone-pitch.

beholders of the better sort of the Contrey wyche have certefyed the same under their handes to the honorable Councell
this was wreton to Mrs Southam from Mr Caudrey D.D.
hym at Rughten [?] the last of March 1599

Religious counsel in prose and verse, especially in the way of warning, appears in abundance. Most of this can be spared the reader, however much he may be in need of it. But one example must be given to round off the picture—Ellesmere 6179.

El. 6179 (34/C/5, 7 a *recto*)

Pryd braggeth	Muche brighter then the mone & higher I ame then all
Angell	Thou clymbest aloft with dangers great to have the greater fall.
Coveteousnes	My mynd with yerthely & worldly thinges can never fylled be
Angell	No Cowe, nor Calffe, nor horse nor mair thou shalt bear hence with the[e]
Lechery	The best thyng of all thyngs is Love, of carnall wemen here
Angell	In the end of lyfe is nothyng worse, nor can be bought more dear
Wrath	I will Revenge wronges to me don, & nothyng will forgeve
Angell	At last you shalt not be forgeven, when you shalt fear to lyve
Glottony	Ther is nothyng more deare to me then foode of daynty meates,
Angell	Such delycates do crave suche paynes to devellyshe helhondes threates
Envy	To see an other prosper well, is greeffe always to me
Angell	By this eternall payne in hell, thow purchasest to the[e]
Slouth	I have farr better will to sleepe, then go to churche or pray
Angell	Thou shalt not sleep when to hell payns thou goest an other day.
	Yf thou wilt sur[e]ly goe to heaven
	Thow must keep tenn & flee from seaven[17]

El. 6179 also has this solemn warning:

If thow beest Ryche in landes or Rentes—what then?
If thou hast a fayre spowse of gentell bloud—what then?
If thou has goodly Children here & kyngly Crowen—what then [?]
If thou thy equals doest excell in every skyll—what then [?]
If thou in yeers in welth & fame doest other pase—what then [?]
Yf fortunes wheele doeth lyft the[e] up eve to the stars—what then [?]
So sone all these thyngs fade away, that nought therof Remayne
Then love & fear god & serve gods will nought ells is good but vayne
Remember thy Synns — To be sory for the same
Remember thy deathe — To seas frome synn
Remember Gods Justece — To fear hym
Remember gods mercy — To avoyd desperation
Thy deathe, & Christes deathe & the worldly wyles
Heavens Joyes & paynes of hell
And Judgment of the latter day
Oft thynke on these thynges & do well

These may be compared with Robert Crowley's "Epigram".

Pleasure and Pain, Heaven and Hell
Remember these four, And all shall be well.

ALBERT PEEL.

[17] The word "Thorne" follows, may be author's name.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.
"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.
(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

Bridge into the Future. Letters of Max Plowman. Dakers. 25s.

A reviewer will rarely meet a more difficult task than that Mrs. Plowman has presented in these letters of her husband, written from 1913 to 1941. He asks at once how many of his contemporaries will deserve a closely printed volume of nearly 800 pp. of letters, with the promise, or threat, of more to come, and wonders at the faith of a publisher who risks so much of his stock of paper. He begins to read, and is put off by masculine endearments, a multitude of unimportant details, and the reproduction of misspellings. Nevertheless he reads on in hope, and finds much to repay him, though he often wishes that the devotion of Mrs. Plowman—and she is a competent editor—had not been so excessive, and that she had pruned more severely.

Max Plowman was a Plymouth Brother who ceased to have connexion with churches and acquired a violent anti-clergy complex. He fought in the last war, became a pacifist in the course of it, and afterwards one of the leaders of the pacifist movement. Blake was one of the major influences in his life, and another was the illness and death of his 12-year-old boy Tim, when the father learnt that

> the life of the body is in the Spirit, and if the body can be brought into harmony with the Spirit, health results.

He came into contact with Mr. Middleton Murry, with whom he was in constant argument, about what is not always clear, and became editor of the *Adelphi* and leader of the Adelphi Community. Finally he was associated with Dick Sheppard (of whom he had the highest opinion) in the P.P.U., and many of the letters discuss differences in that organization when its members were left "as sheep not having a Sheppard". Continually overworked and often ill, he seems to have poured himself out on paper, for it is impossible to believe he ever "lapsed into silence".

What manner of man, then, was Max Plowman? We confess these letters leave us baffled. He speaks of "the exasperating enigma I am to myself", and one of his correspondents calls him "warmhearted, quixotic, but muddleheaded", and we can understand both descriptions. At times he seems "the quintessence of sentimentality", at others shrewd and worldly-wise, here almost feminine in his sensitiveness, there a lover of cricket, and an admirer of Neville Cardus, and a man's man.

He was said to be very humble, but he associates Edmund Gosse, Robert Lynd, Wells, Bennett, and Plowman together, and tells Murry, "I know in my soul I am important to you".

If the man himself remains an enigma to us, we forget him in the issues he raises and in the clarity with which he often states them—so much so that we have to go on reading and making notes. Here are some of ours:

> A man has to learn through his intelligence but a woman learns direct from life. So in the wisdom that's fundamental more women are wise than men. When a man learns he can lead. When a woman learns she becomes like the earth itself out of which all things grow.

She becomes a well of wisdom. A race of women that knew how to be wells, and a race of men who knew how to be fountains of water—the rainbows of heaven would play about such a race.

Of T. S. Eliot:

I regard Eliot as a man who has built himself a dungeon underground where he performs rites by striking sulphurous matches and marvelling at his own illumination. And into this pit go all the nimble wits of the day, each armed with his precious box of lucifers, many striking a light on their heels or their backsides and making grimaces of satisfaction at their astounding cleverness and originality.

Of Reinhold Niebuhr:

I can never see much coming out of disillusionment and I think he's better at proving the inevitability of corporate ineffectuality than anything else. At bottom I think his thesis is self-evident; so that he doesn't cut much ice in proving it so meticulously. And he's definitely shaky when he comes to the value of religion, so that here and there it almost amounts to . . . "individualism is all right—if a man takes to himself a wife he begins to go wrong and where two or three are gathered together there you may expect to find the devil in the midst".

The Church:

"Christianity" has become an enclosure—a place of exemption from military service—a hole to hide in, and it was as such that Dick [Sheppard] was plagued with a sense of duty to get out of it. We do nothing *merely* by going in where he was coming out . . . as I see it, a man's witness nowadays is worth 4d. if he's in the Church, and 9d. if he's outside.

EDITOR.

The Thought of St. James. By A. T. CADOUX, D.D. Clarke. 3s. 6d.

This is a very welcome book. There are commentaries in abundance on the books of the *New Testament,* but too many are content to deal with Introduction and disputed points of exegesis. We look forward to the time when on every book of the *N.T.* there will be a commentary concerned to show not only what it meant to its first readers but what it may mean to us. The *N.T.* finds its unity in its Gospel, but that Gospel is expressed by men of differing temperament and experience. No preacher can afford to neglect any part of the *N.T.*, for in his congregation, too, there will be a similar diversity. It is well that the writers of the *N.T.* should be expounded by those to whom they specially appeal. Thus Dr. Temple told us that for him the most congenial expression of Christianity was not that of St. Paul but of St. John, and to his affinity of thought with St. John we owe his precious *Readings in St. John's Gospel,* whilst others of us find that St. Paul speaks to our need more even than does St. John, and far more than does St. James.

It is appropriate that the Epistle of St. James should have Dr. A. T. Cadoux as its expositor, for its teaching is nearer to that of the earthly Jesus than it is to the Apostolic proclamation of Christ's death and resurrection, and Dr. A. T. Cadoux has already in his earlier books shown himself a competent interpreter of the Synoptic Gospels.

Of this little book of one hundred pages nearly half is given to General Introduction. Unlike many recent scholars, Dr. Cadoux regards the opening verse as an integral part of the Epistle, and so believes that it was written by the brother of our Lord and addressed to Jews of the Diaspora,

whether Christians or not, at a time when the division between Jew and Christian was as yet incomplete. Holding this view, he naturally emphasizes the importance of the fact that of all the writers of the *N.T.* James "alone for so many years shared with Jesus the intimacies of the home".

No careful reader of the Epistle can fail to mark its omission of the great truths connected with the death and resurrection of our Lord. Dr. Cadoux explains the writer's reticence by saying that

> he so writes that the non-Christian Jew may say to himself, "This servant of Jesus has some new way of life that enables him to find joy where I have not found it; he has something that enables him to bring into open speech what I have felt to be right; he has thoughts about life and therefore about God that I have not". . . . The letter resembles the parables of Jesus in its method. It puts no pressure: it sets forth its truth in subtle suggestion, and asks, "What think ye?" and leaves the answer to the reader.

And Dr. Cadoux claims that for non-dogmatic ages the thought of St. James is likely to be more helpful than the Pauline or Johannine theology.

For ourselves, we doubt if in any age Christianity can be rightly preached without reference, we will not say to dogma, for that is an authoritarian word which belongs more to "Catholic" than to Protestant Christianity, but to the *kerugma*, the Apostolic proclamation, of the significance of Christ's death and resurrection. But in every congregation there are Christians of the "once-born" type to whom the Epistle of James speaks more directly than do the Epistles of St. Paul, whilst "Pauline" Christians need its sharp reminder that Christian faith should show itself in deeds. We are grateful that this Epistle has found in Dr. Cadoux so congenial an expositor. From these wise and suggestive pages much may be learnt and many a sermon preached.

SYDNEY CAVE.

The Notebook of John Penry, 1593. Edited for the Royal Historical Society by ALBERT PEEL. (Camden Third Series. Vol. LXVII. 1944.)

During the latter part of the seventeenth century, large bodies of the Quakers of Wales left their native land to join William Penn in Pennsylvania. For the Independents of Wales that was a major misfortune from which we have never fully recovered. The continued influence of Morgan Llwyd did something to fill the gap, but nothing could provide a substitute for the bright serenity, the tolerant certitude, and the quick conscience of the Quaker faith. Such qualities would have given effective help to make our protesting Nonconformist conscience more positive, more generous and less nagging, less ecclesiastical and less sectional and less political perhaps, but certainly more social and ethical. They might not have made us less eloquent and argumentative but certainly less talkative.

The loss of the Quaker element in the Nonconformity of Wales was certainly one of the tragedies of its history.

It was at least quite as great a misfortune for the Independent movement in Wales to have been born fifty years too late to have the privilege of having the rare and choice spirit of John Penry share in its birth-pangs. It would have gained something by exchanging the somewhat foetid political atmosphere of the Civil War for the astringent influence of the Elizabethan ecclesiastical tyranny. None of its pioneers during the Commonwealth—heroic and enthusiastic though some of them were—could stand unashamed before the glowing radiance of his brief, defiant but calm and gentle martyrdom in life and death. William Wroth had something of

his pastoral earnestness, but none of the flaming urgency of his national and personal mission. Walter Cradoc had plenty—perhaps too much—of Penry's cool sanity but not much of his calm vicarious defiance of an insolent, unconstitutional dictatorship. William Erbury had all his simple, revolutionary faith in the Gospel but not much of Penry's reasoned appeal to simple justice and his human love for his people. Vavasor Powel had plenty of Penry's flaming, reckless hatred of official injustice and ecclesiastical inhumanity but not much of that spiritual aloofness of spirit which can stand "above the battle" even while it is raging around him and against him and in him. Perhaps Morgan Llwyd was of them all the nearest to Penry in the high qualities of his soul though he had little of the passionate activity of Penry's missionary zeal.

It was our misfortune as well as theirs, that not one of these pioneers of Independency in Wales seems ever to have so much as heard of John Penry. His name never passes their lips. There is a hungry gap between the herald of a new religious period in Wales and the work of those who actually inaugurated it. Indeed, the nineteenth century had begun its course before the name of John Penry began to be whispered among the elect. And it is only comparatively recently that enough knowledge of his life and work and martyrdom has been spread to make him the best-loved name among the pioneers of religious freedom and reality.

We remember with gratitude the contributions made in this field of research by Hanbury (1839), Waddington (1854), Halliwell (1861), Bacon (1874), Grieve (1904), Burrage (1912, 1913), and more especially by William Pierce, who spent many years gathering the material for his comprehensive and painstaking life of John Penry (1923). Our latest benefactor is Dr. Albert Peel, whose recently published lectures on *The Christian Basis of Democracy*, given to the Bangor School of Theology, were devoted largely to John Penry. It was a great piece of good fortune as well as the legitimate fruit of hard work to come upon the manuscript of John Penry's Notebook as far away as the Huntington Library, San Marino, California. Dr. Peel shows that it was the actual copy used by the Attorney-General in preparing the case against Penry. He has edited the Notebook for the Royal Historical Society. Perhaps he will allow us to look upon it as the prelude to the far more comprehensive task of preparing the much-needed edition of all the writings of John Penry of which he has now made himself the natural author.

There is no need to say that the work of editing the Notebook has been done with all the care, neatness, and competence we have learnt to expect from Dr. Peel since he gave us *The Seconde Parte of a Register*. I am sure that in dealing with this Notebook, he found that even his long apprenticeship to the task of editing original documents was none too long. A glance at the photographic facsimiles of two pages of the original manuscript, inserted between pages 52 and 53, will show that the mere task of interpreting the handwriting demanded an almost infinite patience as well as a very high degree of scientific skill. The fact that Penry lapsed occasionally into Welsh and once at least into using Hebrew letters only adds to the intricacy of the problems which had here to be solved.

The original notes seem to have been thrown together anyhow anywhere, but Dr. Peel has taken the trouble to rearrange the material under thirteen appropriate headings such as annotations on the Scriptures, the Church and the Ministry, the charges against the prelates, personal entries, personal letters, Petitions to Burghley, Essex, and the Council, *etc.* He has also, however, given a list of the Contents in Notebook order with parallel references to the page of Notebook and the page in this edition. He

has also provided the whole with an illuminating introduction as well as numberless textual, literary, and historical notes.

Even such an edition of such a Notebook may not be the best introduction to a study of Penry, but it is an invaluable gift to anybody who knows or half-knows him already. He may not find in it a great deal that is new to him, or much that casts a new light upon Penry himself and his work. In this respect, the most significant sections are the drafts of letters to Burghley on pp. 61 ff. It does seem to me that they do once and for all make it certain that Penry was not the author of any of the Marprelate Tracts, however much he may have had to do with the secret and fugitive Press of the Puritans which printed them. Another thing that gives the Notebook peculiar value is the personal picture it gives of Penry during the last months of his brief life. He never loses his dignity. There may be a very heavy strain on his nerves, and one can occasionally feel the almost unbearable tension but—they never snap. On the whole, in spite of its occasional character, in spite of its haste and its carefree privacy, it is a worthy memorial of one who was making only a desperate appeal that, as he says in this Notebook, "we may die openly or live openly in the land of our nativity".

J. MORGAN JONES.

The Interpreter Spirit and Human Life. By A. J. MACDONALD, D.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

This book represents the White Lectures, 1936, and the Boyle Lectures (third series), 1937. In the first three chapters Dr. Macdonald traces the development of the conception of Spirit in the *O.T.*, observing its early association, as storm-wind, with fire (an association which recurs, perhaps, at Pentecost), and studying the parallel conception of Wisdom, eventually identified with that of Spirit, in the Wisdom Literature and the Apocrypha (*cf.* also *Acts* 6^{10}). He then passes to the *N.T.*, where he distinguishes between the Spirit as Agent and the Spirit as Endowment, and urges that "the Apostolic Church was groping after the double-procession doctrine". After a chapter on the Father as Creator, the Son as Revealer, and the Spirit as Interpreter (whence the book's title), he writes of the Spirit and the Primitive Church, and of the Spirit and the World and the Individual To-day. The core of the book is in chapter four, where it is claimed that the article is used with *Spirit* in *N.T.* Greek where the Spirit is Agent, but not where the Spirit is Endowment. Dr. Macdonald admits that several texts are difficult to reconcile with his principle, and at times takes refuge in positing "hasty expression or confusion of thought", or in such a statement as "The anarthrous reference to the Holy Spirit preserves the divine dignity and sanctity of the Spirit" in the account of the Virgin Birth. There is no reference to the parallel use and omission of the article with such a word as *will*, and it is more likely that the article is omitted for reasons primarily stylistic; *e.g.*, often when the word *Spirit* is followed by a genitive, the article is omitted, as without exception in the LXX for "the Spirit of God", through the influence of the Hebrew "construct" construction.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Atlantis Rising. By DAPHNE VIGERS. Dakers. 7s. 6d.
The Future of Man. By FRANK WARNER. Nicholson & Watson. 7s. 6d.
Morality and Happiness. By LAN FREED. Williams & Norgate. 5s.
Meaning and Purpose. By KENNETH WALKER. Cape. 7s. 6d.
One Kind of Religion. By HELEN WODEHOUSE. Cambridge Press. 8s.

These books represent a number of movements in modern society that have, in varying degree, broken with Christianity. Miss Vigers, a young woman in her middle twenties, claims, as an occultist, to have visited the

lost continent of Atlantis and also to have journeyed into the future and seen it once more elevated above the Atlantic waves. Her description of that model civilization is meant to help us, but her sentimental and jejune occult phantasy gives no guidance to modern European man in his tragic situation. To write of Utopias is not in itself an idle task—Plato's *Republic* has been one of the most creative books of human history—but Miss Vigers is so devoid of a sense of political reality, so nauseatingly free from a real sense of historical tragedy, that her book is useless save to make her sentimental followers more sentimental still.

Frank Warner I take to be a Palestinian Jew, as I know him for a humanist of the economic kind. Utopia *is* just round the corner, if we had but the sense rightly to use the resources of the earth. This is true, as many idealist platitudes are, and it gives the book a reality wholly lacking in Miss Vigers's work. But in its own way this is vitiated by the same fault as hers—the failure to deal with man's empirical situation and to consider the next step towards its betterment. In addition there is much internal contradiction, and Mr. Warner's conception of religion betrays the effeteness of the philosophy on which he builds. Religion, he thinks, should never be the concern of the many. Essentially it is a purely private and incommunicable experience possessed by but a few specially endowed individuals. Mr. Warner begins his book with a reference to the Bible; but this notion of religion shows how far he has wandered from the morality, the social power, and the universal reach of the religion of the great prophets of Israel, to say nothing of our Lord.

Mrs. Freed is the "left wing" politician of the company, and writes to defend an a-moral position. This is a live and in many ways a competent enough book; though I cannot help thinking that a person who knows enough to write it ought to be above the propagandist's trick of imputing an untenable and unheld position to an opponent as a preliminary to his complete defeat. Thus religious thinkers and "moralists" (equally a term of reproach!) unite, according to Mrs. Freed, in equating "what I ought to do" with "what I really don't want to do", and in denying benevolent impulses to man. But the former assertion caricatures even Kant, and the latter ignores the work of Bishop Butler, to say nothing of the teaching of Jesus. Had Mrs. Freed written simply out of her own concern for the welfare of others, she would have produced a lively and helpful book. It is a sad reflection that she was once a Christian, and now has such inadequate ideas of what Christians believe and think, and of what they stand for in the secular world.

Kenneth Walker is a scientific humanist, and writes of the changes wrought by science in the thought of the last hundred years or so. He gives a short but not very profound account of evolutionism, the new physics, and psychology, and tries to assess their contribution. He then considers the nature of religion and the modern substitutes for it—positivism, racialism, communism. He writes from a conviction that science cannot deal with the question man most wants to ask, and that therefore a religious approach to reality is also valid. He subjects the new "modern" religions to some sound criticism, and complains that the traditional religion of Europe has not adjusted its beliefs to a scientific age. There is much food for salutary reflection here, but the fault is this: Mr. Walker thinks that all the great religions of the world are really expressing the same values! And even worse:

> neither I nor anyone else can speak otherwise than subjectively. What a man writes down on paper, whether he be scientist, philosopher or poet, can only be the report of his total human experience.

However much the Church may have erred in superfluous zeal to defend effete dogmas, she has even there been fighting for the conviction so necessary as a condition of all science, that of two incompatible truths one at least must be false. Finally, I hope that if this book goes into a second edition Mr. Walker will complete his references (*e.g.*, *Acts*, 44-45!) and cease to class Kant as a "positivist philosopher".

I can only describe Helen Wodehouse as a "post-Christian humanist"; she has written the most powerful and beautiful book of them all. She tries to give weight to all that is positive in the Christian religion, and she clothes it with language and allusion rich in the extreme. But I could not help feeling that much of what she was saying was more Christian than she knew, and—let me confess—that much of what we find to say is often less Christian than we think! She wants a religion no longer dependent on the outworn cosmology of the Bible, but it is very questionable whether her exchange of the Christian abstraction of "God" for the philosophical abstraction of the "concrete universal of the Good" brings her really up to date! But that does not touch the heart of the problem her book raises. I have been forced to ask myself, "Is this an impossible substitute for Christianity? Has she lost something real and vital?" She comes so near to Christianity with her humanism that I would urge all our ministers to read it, and then sweat and think and pray until they had found the answers to those two questions. To answer them is to know on what rock you stand. Miss Wodehouse is not far from the Kingdom of God, and I trust that this beautiful, challenging, haunting book will help us all to a firmer faith and a deeper integrity.

Finally, I would invite these five modern prophets to reckon seriously with something all of them have missed—the central Christian assertion that something has happened in the full public glare of history, which is represented in the words "and was made man". It is my faith in a God who works and has been incarnate in history that each of them ignores, and that would break the bands of their thought. Miss Vigers would be dealing with public history instead of with a private, occult, and widely rejected myth. She would learn how political and social and religious realities unite to weave man's historical destiny, and how God redeems man from evil. Mr. Warner would know that religion is not necessarily a private experience, but a relation to an historical (and supra-historical) person. Mrs. Freed would see how in one life the "is" and the "ought", the real and the ideal, were brought together. Kenneth Walker would realize that ultimate meanings can be disclosed and objectivity brought into religious discussion. Miss Wodehouse would learn that her attempt to write of a religion of incarnation has not come within sight of the distinctively Christian belief and trust. Without this unique, this real and historical, incarnation, all the other "incarnations" of which she writes are, as Mr. Walker feels, anybody's guess. It is not unfair to say that these authors have all fulfilled Mr. Walker's prophecy, and written "a report of their total human experience". But of their experience they are the sole reporters, and no question of truth or falsity arises, no act of decision is demanded. But the Gospel is news. Like the matter in *The Times* or the *Daily Worker*, it is either true or false. It demands affirmation or denial. Here are five denials; I can only say that, having read them, I must still affirm. JOHN MARSH.

Happiness, Freedom and God. By C. A. RICHARDSON. Harrap. 7s. 6d.

This very suggestive book is a sustained attempt at a metaphysic along the lines of spiritual pluralism. It is in fact an up-to-date version of the Monadology of Leibnitz. Mr. Richardson rightly considers that, while

modern philosophy has done great things in analysis, most of it fails to answer the perennial human questions about the whence and the whither of Life and the Universe. The answer to these questions cannot be given in terms of strict logic; but that does not mean that no answer should be attempted.

Mr. Richardson follows Leibnitz in viewing the Universe as composed of spiritual subjects or Monads, with God as the Chief Monad. But he differs from the great philosopher in that he assumes interaction between the Monads. This interaction is the basis of their individual experience, though its basis only, since they react upon external influences by their own spontaneity. It is through the conflict of the Monads that evil enters the world; but God, the Chief Monad, who holds the rest in unity, continually influences them all in the direction of mutual harmony. The aim of all conscious life is happiness, and the aim of God is to promote the greatest happiness of all conscious beings. Ethics, therefore, is a matter of wisdom. As the Monads, influenced by God, come more and more to recognize their true interest, they more and more will seek the happiness only to be had in mutual harmony. Mr. Richardson follows Leibnitz in regarding the Monads as of all degrees from the unconsciousness of inanimate matter to the full consciousness of humanity and the perfect and all-embracing consciousness of God. He associates evil primarily with inanimate matter, which, being below the level of consciousness, lacks the insight of the wisdom which makes for harmony.

Again, following Leibnitz, Mr. Richardson regards the body of man as a conglomeration of Monads, dominated by the conscious self. It is here that he introduces his doctrine of time and immortality. The individual Monads do not exist in time. Time exists in them. Consequently, the separation of the conscious self from the body leaves the self essentially untouched, though it has no longer the body as its instrument. Mr. Richardson's immortality is the timelessness, not only of God, but also of all other subjects of experience. From the same point of view, a settlement is found for the problem of freedom. The Monads are free so far as they act from their own nature: in a word, their freedom is seen in the spontaneity of their reaction to the influence of the rest of the Universe.

The most difficult and the most novel part of Mr. Richardson's doctrine is his further treatment of time. Time is a way of recognizing a certain order in the timeless experience of the Monad, by which the events forming its unity may be analysed into a succession. Mr. Richardson admits a "sense" or direction of the order, which makes the analysis time-like. One single event is what is realized as the "specious present" of psychology, which again may be subdivided into partial events: the structure of these parts generates the notion of space.

"True time", however, is not the time of mathematical physics: it is rather a field or region of probabilities, in which possible events approach the Monad and either occur or pass it by. This field may be represented by a mathematical construction in four dimensions, which is a "space-time" different from that of the modern theory of relativity, but which is convertible into it by means of a simple mathematical transformation. Mr. Richardson goes on to show how by means of this transformation his theory of probability leads to the principles of modern quantum theory. The fundamental difference between his "space-time" and that of Einstein may be stated as follows. In Mr. Richardson's "space-time" the Monad or subject remains unmoved as the centre of its Universe and possible events approach it: in the "space-time" of Einstein every ultimate particle traces out a "world-line", along which the different events of its existence are strung out.

Has Mr. Richardson really done more than transform the world view of physics into the individual perspective of the Monad? Is his novelty something really different, or only a variant of the common doctrine? Does he implicitly assume in his construction from the beginning most of what he sets out to prove in the end? These and many other questions will be asked about what is certainly the most original and also a very interesting part of his book. But the occurrence of the questions should not make us overlook the value of the rest of the book as a remarkably consistent re-statement, with important differences, of the Monadology of Leibnitz, which has been called, not without reason, "the most beautiful of all metaphysics".

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

This is the Message. A Continental Reply to Charles Raven. By FRANZ HILDEBRAND, Ph.D. Lutterworth Press. 4s. 6d.

Anyone who desires without great labour to understand the attitude of the present-day theology of the German Confessional Church cannot do better than study this little volume, in which its principles are set out with great clearness, and not without much amusing pleasantry, in a series of friendly letters to Professor Raven. The "Reply" is made to Dr. Raven's *Good News of God,* and is an attack all along the line upon its modernism. The argument is that of Brunner's well-known book, *The Mediator;* and may be summed up in the antithesis which furnishes the title of another of Brunner's writings—Mysticism *versus* the Word. The Liberal Theology which is represented by Dr. Raven builds on religious experience and sees its perfect realization in Christ, Who thereby becomes the principle of a higher life among men in which the break in communion with God, caused by sin, is overcome. Dr. Hildebrand will have none of this: it is not Biblical. Christ is not the culmination of humanity, but a sheer gift from above to be received with a faith which is not human but divine in its origin. The true "Good News of God" is to be read in Paul, Luther, and in John and Charles Wesley.

All that can be said in this brief notice of a most interesting little book is that its Confessional "Biblical" theology rests on the assumption that men to-day are required by God to think in terms of the gospel just as the Apostle Paul preached it. How far Dr. Hildebrand will go in this direction is shown by his insistence on our accepting literally the Second Coming of Christ, because it is "Biblical".

The whole argument, however, loses its force, if it is admitted, as it must be, that the Pauline theology, great as it is, is expressed entirely in terms of the thought of the ancient world, which no longer holds to-day. Consequently, it is the duty of the theologian of the twentieth century to retranslate the essential content of Christianity into our modern idiom, however difficult the task may be. And, above all, it has to be recognized that to find the prime essence of Christianity it is necessary to go back from Paul the Apostle to Jesus Himself, whose bondservant it was his proudest title to be. The Pauline epistles must be interpreted from the Synoptic Gospels, and not the Synoptic Gospels from the Pauline epistles. Then, and only then, can the modern retranslation begin.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

An Introduction to Philosophy. By W. A. SINCLAIR. Oxford Press. 5s.

Mr. Sinclair's purpose is to teach the nature of philosophy by leading his readers to philosophize along with him. Philosophy is not the learning of historical systems, but is the thinking through of them so that in the process one's mentality is altered. Its effect is to make us aware of and to

question modes of thought which we continually apply unconsciously without realizing that we do so.

It is, above all, the nature of knowledge itself that we need to inquire into: knowledge seems a simple thing until we examine it, but in reality it is far otherwise. Mr. Sinclair, therefore, begins by stating the representationism of Descartes and Locke, which has almost become an article of faith with many men of science. There is the external physical world, colourless, soundless, odourless; and, caused by this, there is our representative image of it in perception, full of colour, sound, and odour, these qualities being subjectively added by the mind. It is next shown how Berkeley criticized Descartes and Locke, asking if there was any need of the supposed external world as cause of our subjective representations: why not cut it out and suppose that there is nothing but spirits and the images within them? Mr. Sinclair believes that the reader will feel, like Dr. Johnson, that this will not do; and he offers in place of Berkeleyism a theory of knowledge based on the principles of selection and grouping. We form our experience by selecting some things for our attention: the advance of knowledge consists in the grouping of the elements of experience so as more and more to form a coherent whole.

The great merits of this little book lie in the contagious enthusiasm of the author for his subject and the remarkable clearness with which he explains difficult matters. No better "Introduction to Philosophy" could be imagined for a thoughtful person ignorant of its nature, but wishful to know what it really is. The only necessary caution to be given to the reader is that he should not in the end accept as dogma Mr. Sinclair's own suggested theory of knowledge, but should go on with his study of philosophy so as to obtain a wider background, in view of which to accept it or perhaps seek further.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

(*Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.*)

At a time when there is much glib depreciation of the *O.T.* it is good to meet with a book like the Rev. H. F. D. Sparks's *The Old Testament in the Christian Church* (S.C.M., 6s.). An Anglican writing for laymen, Mr. Sparks outlines the traditional attitude to the *O.T.*, shows how modern discoveries have affected it, and then discusses in what sense the *O.T.* is "an essential part of any Christian faith that is worthy of the name". He finds the *O.T.* has literary, historical, and anthropological value, that the *N.T.* cannot be understood without it, and that it is "an interpretation of the activity of God".

Dr. F. C. Grant is one of the leading *N.T.* scholars in the United States, and his *Can We Still Believe in Immortality?* (Louisville: Cloister Press, $2.00) is a "Religious Book Club Selection" there. Written to help those who have been bereaved in war, it is a succinct survey of the problem, but it is doubtful whether all those for whom it is intended will be able to grasp the philosophical section; scholars who use the terminology will find it helpful, and preachers could translate it into the vernacular.

The news of another volume of sermons by Prof. A. J. Gossip—*Experience Worketh Hope* (Clark, 8s.)—will be hailed with delight by preachers the world over. Not that Dr. Gossip's sermons are preachable by anyone but himself—that is perhaps why they are real preaching—but because at the same time as they suggest ideas they show what preaching

can be. Again we have the marvellous breadth of illustration from life and literature, again the intense burning faith, again the authentic note of personal experience. In one of these sermons—there are twenty of them—the preacher quotes Carlyle, "What this parish needs is what every parish needs—a man who knows God at more than second hand". Dr. Gossip is such a man: as he comes into the pulpit his face shines, and he can take his hearers with him into the heavenly places.

Every intelligent Christian should read Dr. K. S. Latourette's **The Unquenchable Light* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 7s. 6d.), where the historian of the expansion of Christianity surveys the past and examines the future. Dr. Latourette sees the history of Christianity in recurring advances (to 500, 950-1350, 1500-1750, 1815-1914) and recessions (500-950, 1350-1500, 1750-1815), each advance carrying the wave a little farther forward. Will the apparent recession since 1914 obey the same law? Is it indeed a recession? What is the future of Christianity? Will the United States, with its large proportion of nominal Christians and its vast resources, come to play the major part in the drama of Christianity? To these and similar questions Dr. Latourette addresses himself; always well-informed, with keen insight and sound judgment, he has much to say which compels attention.

We invariably find Prof. John Foster stimulating, and we warmly commend his **World Church* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.), which should be read with Dr. Latourette's book. Prof. Foster's missionary experience adds authority and vividness to his narrative, while he has always new information to pass on or to correlate—such as that relating to early Christianity in India and China. Occasionally we feel that his enthusiasm leads him to read more into the evidence than it can bear, but enthusiasm of any sort is now so rare that it is welcome. The best chapters in the book are IV and V: "Universal: Eastward Progress in the Early Centuries" and "Interdependent: East and West in the Middle Ages".

Mr. Francis Bacon's *Eastern Pilgrimage* (Lutterworth Press, 5s.) will serve as an effective introduction for those who desire to learn about the Eastern Church, as all Christians should. Its main value is to be found not in the statistics (there are said to be 172,000,000 members in the different Rites) or the history, but in the final chapter on "The Spirit of the East"; it is claimed that the Eastern Church is "nearer to the life and practice of the Primitive Church than any Christian group", and a sympathetic account is given of the conception of the Eucharist, Ordination, *etc.*

Dom Gregory Dix's *The Question of Anglican Orders* (Dacre Press, 4s. 6d.) is in the form of letters to a layman. If the writer's premisses are accepted, his argument is cogent, and Protestants would do well to ponder his best pages—those in which he examines the doctrine of justification by faith. But the whole emphasis seems to us mechanical and alien to vital religion; what Dom Gregory Dix deems crucial seems to us unimportant, and all this discussion about "form" and "matter" as far removed from the mind of Christ as can be; baptism is necessary to salvation, and by baptism is meant not the baptism of the Spirit, but baptism by water in the proper form with the use of the proper words.

The Rev. C. H. Cleal's *The Chaplain in the Factory* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) is an informing and helpful account of this new aspect of ministerial service, which he conceives as helping to bridge the gulf between the Factory and the Church. Mr. Cleal writes in a practical fashion, and his experience should be useful to all who have to tackle a far from easy task. We wonder whether lay people, set apart by the Church as its representatives in a workshop, would not be more effective than "professional ministers"; an engineer who gladly recognizes that it is his business to win other engineers

to make a cell of the Church would, it seems to us, find the way less difficult than a man handicapped by a collar, a title, and a stipend.

It is not often that our reaction to a book is "This is important and must be read again and carefully studied", but so it was with "Lord Herbert of Cherbury's *De Religione Laici*, Edited and Translated with A Critical Discussion of His Life and Philosophy, and A Comprehensive Bibliography of His Works", by Mr. Harold L. Hutcheson (Yale & Oxford Presses, 20s.). Mr. Hutcheson has given us a very competent piece of work, and one that is useful too, for, apart from a chapter by Prof. C. C. J. Webb, there is little authoritative work about "the founder of English deism". The critical discussion is adequate and helpful, we have the text in Latin and English on opposite pages, and a full bibliography; this is based on nine American libraries and the author's own collection, and it is a pity it does not include the Huntington Library, perhaps the richest of them all. But Mr. Hutcheson deserves the gratitude of all students of his subject and of the period.

We are indebted to Mr. Wilson Harris for a very pleasant evening, even though it was marred by the regret that much of Caroline Fox's journal had been destroyed; grateful for much, we could not but think what might have been. A prudent—no doubt too prudent—selection was published in 1882, and from this and other sources Mr. Harris has compiled an attractive biography, *Caroline Fox* (Constable, 15s.). Born of Cornish Quaker stock in 1819, Caroline's life ranged—to use one of her favourite words—round the foci of Friends and Science, with regular visits to the Yearly Meeting and to the British Association. Her father's business and scientific interests brought many well-known people to their home—to Caroline's great good fortune and to ours, for she has an unusual gift of description: we have vivid glimpses of Carlyle (how well "energetic melancholy" sums him up), Mill, Cobden, Bright, W. E. Forster, of famous scientists, artists, and travellers. And, of course, of John Sterling, with whom it was plain to us from p. 68 (Mr. Wilson Harris is much more cautious) Caroline was in love. She died unmarried in 1871, leaving in her journal a picture of a cultured Quaker Victorian woman, the colours in which, we imagine, will surprise many.

It is probable that the reputation Mr. George Seaver gained by his *Edward Wilson* will lead many to open *Albert Schweitzer: Christian Revolutionary* (Clarke, 5s.) in the expectation of reading something biographical. They will be disappointed, though the discipline of working through Mr. Seaver's exposition of Schweitzer's writings—so varied, so significant—will be worth while. It is sometimes difficult to know where Schweitzer ends and where Seaver begins, but the exegete possesses insight and helps to an understanding of the master. Once more we feel that the man is greater than all his works, and reconcile ourselves to our own loss: many, many years ago Dr. Schweitzer promised two articles for our pages; when tackled about them, he replied that he had "been too busy opening stomachs", and who would be prepared to say that he had not done more for the Kingdom of God by means of the knife than he would have done by the pen?

When International Congregationalism becomes a reality, we in this country shall know more about Congregational scholars in America. Meanwhile we hope many copies of *Daniel Evans: Teacher, Preacher, Theologian* (Pilgrim Press, $2.00) will find their way over. One hard-boiled reviewer has been deeply moved as he has read the story of Dan Evans's life, not so much because he was familiar with many of those mentioned in it, but because of the successful struggle for education and fuller life recorded. Wales and America can share the credit for Evans. His father left S. Wales to make a home for his family, and was killed in an accident. His mother

took seven children across the Atlantic, Dan being three years old. He went to work at the pithead before he was seven, but finally followed two brothers into the ministry and then became a Professor at Andover-Newton, dying suddenly in 1943. Dr. Raymond Calkins edits the volume, to which many of Evans's colleagues contribute, but the core is 120 pages of autobiography. The part Evans played in the litigation about the Andover Creed which resulted in the divorce of Andover from Harvard was creditable; it would have been unfortunate indeed had no further service been open to him. An English proof-reader would have corrected slips like "Dr. Morgan Gibbons".

The Rev. A. T. S. James's **A Cotswold Minister* (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.) is a memoir of C. Ernest Watson, of Rodborough Tabernacle, written with insight and affection. Perhaps Congregationalism has never fully realized what a choice spirit Watson was; certainly far too few Congregationalists know how he made the church meeting the centre of a living church, and trained a generation of people in worship, fellowship, and service. The *Rodborough Bede Book* stands as a testimony to his liturgical skill, and there are many in the Cotswolds who call him blessed. Mr. James's appreciation should be a stimulus and encouragement to many ministers.

Mr. Alexander Gammie has edited and compiled "A Book of Remembrance", *Professor Duncan M. Blair* (Pickering, 3s.), a worthy tribute to the Glasgow Professor of Anatomy who died in November last at the age of 48. Duncan Blair was a scientist who was a convinced Christian, a Calvinist, and an elder of the Free Church of Scotland who took an active part in the I.V.F. and was held in esteem and affection by colleagues and students, and by all who knew him.

The Rev. Nelson Bitton's *Alfred Sadd of the Gilberts* (Livingstone Press, 1s.) is the well-told story of a heroic life which ought to be widely circulated among young people.

Henry W. Nevinson had many friends and admirers, and they will rejoice to see *Visions and Memories* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.), and be grateful to his wife for gathering these gleanings of poetry and prose. If we were asked to put the constituents of the volume in order of interest, we should have no hesitation—memories, poems, visions. The memories have a vivacity, a timelessness, we do not find in the "visions", articles which often date themselves. In the memories we live Nevinson's life again with him, at Oxford, in Greece ("Greeks: A Transformation" switched the mind at once to the last three months in Greece), Africa, or wherever it may be. The poems suggest the writer's passions—freedom, the open air, independence. Here is "A Veteran's Prayer", written in 1939:

> Feet, that have borne me for uncounted miles
> O'er marsh and mountain, smiling, strong, and grave.
> Be not too feeble, now that nothing smiles,
> To bear me half a furlong toward the grave.

But even a noble mind has strange aberrations, as, *e.g.*, "that rather arid record, *The Acts of the Apostles*", "the rather unimaginative author of *The Acts*" and "As the most confused of Early Christian writers once said in a lucid interval, 'We have put away childish things' ".

Books about journalism we always read with great avidity, and *Memories of George Gilbert Armstrong* (Clarke, 10s. 6d.) was no exception. Son of a leading Unitarian minister, Mr. Armstrong himself became President of the Unitarian Churches in England, and also for a time editor of *The Inquirer*. He was a keen Liberal, and served Liberal papers in Liver-

pool, Nottingham, Bradford, Darlington, and Bolton, before becoming editor of the Manchester edition of the *Daily News*. Many of the familiar names of journalism stud his pages, and once more we learn how pathetically precarious is the journalist's lot. Mr. Armstrong's life has seen a good deal of struggle and of sorrow, and now in loneliness he looks back, having lost his helper during 47 years, and a cherished only son. He has had strong convictions and has always dared to express them, and has, we think, enjoyed life. He confesses that spelling has always been a weakness: there is evidence of this in the book, and a pleasing misprint, for he calls himself a "stormy petrol".

Mr. Reginald L. Hine's *Confessions of an Un-common Attorney* (Dent, 15s.) is one of those books which leave the war-time reviewer in despair: there are stories to quote on every page, and no space in which to quote them! Mr. Hine's *History of Hitchin* is a model for local historians, and this book will take an equal place in its own field. Mr. Hine is one of those fortunate men whose work and hobby, whose labour and enjoyment, run together. Attorney and antiquarian, he is always dealing with men, alive or dead, and finding pleasure in his task. About lawyers, doctors, parsons, writers, he chats in turn, never wanting illustrations, which often cause a smile, sometimes a chuckle, and occasionally even a guffaw. Were we to start quoting the stories we should never stop, but here are Bishop Stubbs's "three rules of life: never do anything underhand, never get your feet wet, go to bed at ten", and the pompous police officer's reply to Sir Frank Lockwood's remark that the magistrates were getting on well with their agenda, "Yes, sir, their worships always dispense with justice very fast here".

A learned Roman Catholic scholar declared recently that all the intelligence in the hierarchy in Britain was to be found in Bishop David Mathew. Without discussing this domestic issue, we may say that it is a good thing for his Church that Bishop Mathew's scholarship finds scope in such works as *The Naval Heritage* (Collins, 12s. 6d.), a readable history of the British Navy. The story is largely written round persons—Drake, Blake, Howe, Rodney, Hood, Nelson above all, and Fisher; but the development from sail to steam, wood to iron, in armament and technique, also finds a place, while the main battles are admirably described. The last chapter is so hurried as to be scamped, and the element of treachery and surprise was such that we imagine Americans will protest against the description of the attack on Pearl Harbour as "skilfully planned and executed". There is a very useful glossary—and a misprint on p. 83.

It seems to us a most encouraging sign that from a Technical College—the South-West Essex Technical College and School of Art—should come such a book as Dr. D. C. Collins's *Handlist of New Pamphlets, 1590-1610* (10s. 6d.). The volume contains an interesting Introduction, the Handlist of 271 pamphlets printed in the two decades and still extant, and Indexes of Printers and Publishers of News Pamphlets, Persons, and Subjects. Probably quite half the pamphlets deal with foreign affairs, especially with battles and campaigns; the "home" news generally consists of fires and floods, murders and monstrosities. There is little about religious affairs, though one pamphlet deals with the Arthington-Hacket conspiracy. Dr. Collins has given us a useful and competent piece of work.

All who have used Dr. A. J. Whyte's *The Political Life and Letters of Cavour* will open his *The Evolution of Modern Italy* (Blackwell, 18s.) with confidence—and they will not be disappointed. Dr. Whyte's task, in surveying the years from 1715 to 1920 in 260 pp., is not an easy one, and we are sensible of hurry in the last two chapters, but he successfully surmounts

the difficulties, and never fails to be readable. From the days in our 'teens when we first thrilled to the story of the *Risorgimento*, we have devoured everything relating to the period, and it has been good to travel a familiar road with a guide so well-informed as Dr. Whyte.

The increased attention to the Versailles Peace Conference is, we hope, a harbinger of another Peace Conference in the near future. Dr. F. S. Marston's *The Peace Conference of 1919* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.) is a masterly account of the organization and procedure of the Conference; it should be compulsory reading for all those, from Heads of States to experts and reporters, who will be present at the Conference when the present War is over, for they will quickly be reminded of difficulties to be faced and mistakes to be avoided. The chronology and bibliography add to the value of a volume which well deserves Prof. C. K. Webster's warm commendation.

Although he writes from Oxford, Mr. R. B. McCallum, the author of *Public Opinion and the Last Peace* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.), hails from Scotland, and is proud of the fact. He has strong opinions—even prejudices, among them a dislike of Mr. E. H. Carr—but he has given us a well-written and stimulating defence of the Treaty of Versailles, and a survey of the attitude of statesmen and peoples to the Treaty in the period between the Wars. Like Prof. T. E. Jessop, he holds that it is not so much the Treaty that was at fault as the people who derided and ignored it, and failed to implement its provisions. Turning to the future, Mr. McCallum suggests a Union (the word "Federal" he deems unnecessary) of Britain, France, Norway, Belgium, and Holland. A book that should be read by all concerned with the future of Europe—and mankind.

We did not find Mr. Lindley Fraser's "study of propaganda and war-guilt", *Germany between Two Wars* (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d.), as effective as some of his broadcasts, perhaps because his subject-matter is now more familiar. Mr. Fraser has no difficulty in disposing of German claims that her Army was undefeated in 1918; that she laid down arms on the promise of a peace based on the Fourteen Points, which the Allies ignored; that the Allies deliberately continued the blockade and starved German children; that the rapacious reparations demands caused inflation in the 'twenties and depression in the 'thirties; that Hitler worked for peace and other nations to encircle him; and that the present war is one of self-defence. The evidence is so much on Mr. Fraser's side that it is a pity he uses stories which "may be apocryphal" (p. 42) and that, in a work which should suggest trustworthiness in every detail, he gives an incorrect date for King Edward's abdication.

Dr. J. T. MacCurdy's "psychological essay", *Germany, Russia and the Future* (Cambridge Press, 3s. 6d.), is quite up to the level of the admirable "Current Affairs" series. Mainly concerned with Russia, as its chapter-headings show (The *Herrenvolk* Myth and its Consequences; Russian Ideology and its Evolution; Contemporary Objectives and Methods in Russia; The Future of Communist Russia—(1) Foreign Policy, (2) Internal Evolution), it deserves the attention of all students of politics. See "Worth Noting".

No. 8 in the "Target for Tomorrow" series is *The Future of the Colonies* (Pilot Press, 4s. 6d.), by Dr. Julian Huxley and Miss Phyllis Deane. The illustrations are good, and the informing letterpress would form an excellent basis for a discussion on a subject about which one hears more in America than at home.

Nobody better qualified than Mrs. L. S. Florence could have been found to write *Our Private Lives* (Harrap, 6s.). Born in America and for long resident in Britain, she makes an effective comparison of the lives of the

two peoples. In this volume of the "America and Britain" series the diagrams really illustrate, and the contrasted pictures side by side speak for themselves. There are misprints on pp. 29 and 51, and, seeing the part played by the Pilgrims in the settlement of America., Mrs. Florence might have included the Congregationalists among the denominations to be found there!

In these days, when so much writing is slipshod and even slapdash, it is good to read Mr. Harold Nicolson, and we have greatly enjoyed *Friday Mornings* (Constable, 8s. 6d.), the reprint of his "Marginal Comment" in the *Spectator*. So many moderns do not seem to realize that the correct word is as important in a literary column as is the correct figure in the column of a bank statement. Mr. Nicolson, if anything, makes the other mistake: we smell the fumes of the midnight oil; we see him "waiting for the word", as J. H. Jowett used to do in preaching; and sometimes the impression is that of artificiality and lack of spontaneity. This is especially so when he is so pleased with his figure that he repeats it on the following page, as when "the sullen September waned across the Weald of Kent", or when he obviously tries to be unusual and the top of a London omnibus (certainly not a bus to Mr. Nicolson) becomes a "swaying parapet of delight". But these blemishes are only occasional; generally the sensitiveness of the style delights and the figures are perfectly apt, as when the moderns "with the tiny torches of their own knowledge grope amid the majestic ruins of the past". Often the comment is not marginal: it is near the centre, and always pertinent and well informed, even if sometimes the commentator amuses us by the casual way he introduces his tea-parties with royalty, or his acquaintance with many lands. The fact that these essays are as readable and suggestive now as when they first appeared (August, 1941—March, 1944) is the best tribute we can pay to their quality. Few there be who would not learn from them on a second reading. But, Mr. Nicolson—"would" for "should" (p. 62). *Et tu, Brute!*

While we may agree with Mr. Aneurin Bevan, we cannot say that his methods appeal to us. In *Why Not Trust the Tories?* (Gollancz, 2s. 6d.) he argues that the experience of 1919 is likely to be repeated; those artful devils the Tories will divide the progressive forces and use all manner of fair words to secure a majority which will safeguard the interests of property. In essence he is right, but that does not mean that every Tory is a liar and an embodiment of all evil! We believe that by going back on their word and not accepting the report of the Sankey Commission the Government of the day did much to undermine the confidence of the working classes in parliamentary methods. Mr. Bevan's outline of the tactics by which progressive measures are delayed or destroyed is also true to the experience of recent months. And yet we cannot think that a book written in this spirit will win converts. Mr. John Strachey's *Why You Should be a Socialist* (Gollancz, 2s. 6d.) is another story, though we wonder if Mr. Strachey sounds so patronizing to other people as he invariably does to us. In the main Mr. Strachey's argument is sound, though sometimes he skates swiftly over difficulties.

As we read Part I, "The Plight of the Liberal Democratic University", of the Rev. A. S. Nash's *The University and the Modern World* (S.C.M., 12s. 6d.) we felt that we had in our hands what might be a dynamic book. Part II, "The Totalitarian University: A True Diagnosis but a False Remedy", seemed chopped straw when we wanted to reach constructive suggestions, but these somehow lacked the point which marked the analysis in Part I; Mr. Nash seemed to have caught the long involved sentence from Mannheim, and to be more intent on criticizing others—on con-

secutive pages he suggests that unconsciously two writers speak with greater truth than they know—than on clarifying his own ideas, and his insight to have expended itself. Here, however, is one conclusion, that what is needed is a Christian *speculum mentis:*

> the Christian Churches need a fellowship of lay theologians or Christian scholars who would view it as part of their vocation as a Christian intelligentsia to create a Christian world view within which the conclusions of the specialized subjects of the university curriculum could be given their ultimate meaning in terms of a specifically Christian philosophy of man and of his relation to the historical process.

Mr. Nash has had peculiar opportunities for studying College life in Britain and the United States, and we hope he will throw further light on the subject, though at times he seems to despair of the universities as the home of a new intellectual reformation. This present book ought to be read; though it does not live up to its promise, it is a seed-bed of ideas.

So much has happened in the field of youth work in a short time that most people simply don't know where they are. There should therefore be a great welcome for Mr. Douglas Cooke's **Youth Organisations of Great Britain, 1944-45* (Jordan, 8s. 6d.), a handbook which will prove of great service, for nowhere else can the information it contains be found assembled. All manner of organizations are described, and there are lists of books and of addresses of Societies. The price, we fear, will prevent the book from reaching many hands which need it: we hope next year it may be halved.

Mr. E. H. Hayes and the Rev. R. G. Martin have edited *Round the Club-Room Fire* (R.E.P., 3s. 6d.), "Informal Talks for Youth Clubs on Work, Leisure, and Relationships", and Mr. Leslie E. Keating is responsible for a helpful study of *Sex Education in the Club* (R.E.P., 1s. 6d.). Those engaged in Youth Work should not overlook *Religion in Boys' Clubs* (N.A.B.C., 9d.), the Report of a Commission appointed by the National Association of Boys' Clubs, nor *Christ the King* (Ludgate Circus House, 9d.), a book of responsive services for youth arranged by Gertrude and Godfrey S. Pain.

The Congregational contribution to youth training is the Church Training Fellowship, the handbook for which, **Church Youth Training* (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.), ministers of all denominations ought to see. It has been largely drawn upon in the British Council of Churches' pamphlet, *Programme Possibilities for Church Youth Groups* (S.C.M. 1s.), a useful survey, though the bibliographies are marked by the timidity which so often marks "united" publications, and against which the British Council would be wise to set its face.

The future of British education in general is discussed in Mr. John Newsom's *Willingly to School* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), where, after prefacing that Butler depends on Beveridge, the author deals with the importance of education, the ideal of the Common School, and some of the problems of Secondary Education, Youth Work, and the Training of Teachers.

In *Christianity and Boys* (Macmillan, 3s. 6d.) Dr. P. T. Freeman, of Peter Symonds' School, Winchester, maintains that not 2 per cent of boys go to church regularly, and that is because the conceptions of the Christian Faith held by the clergy and enshrined in the Creeds are obsolete. Dr. Freeman then outlines his own conception—that of a modernist of a radical type—and claims that boys respond to it.

While Sir Richard Livingstone and others have recently been reminding us about the part played by People's Colleges in Denmark, little is known about the *Folkhögskola* of Sweden. Mrs. F. Margaret Forster's *School for*

Life (Faber, 6s.), written after personal investigation, fills that gap, describing colleges of various types. There are now 59 State-aided institutions, with 2,000 men (2,646 in 1934) and 4,200 women. Mrs. Forster suggests how Britain might benefit from the experience of Sweden, and hints that Colleges for adults might be useful in the re-education of Germany.

In **Can the Family Survive?* (S.C.M., 5s.) the Rev. E. C. Urwin has written a timely little book, which ministers will find helpful. It is written with much more candour than such a book would have been a generation ago, though it is clear Mr. Urwin knows little at first-hand about the theory and practice of those, notably young people, who do not accept Christian standards, indeed who, in many cases, have never heard of them. It is surprising, too, that Mr. Urwin had to be introduced to some important books on the subject which are familiar to students. Nevertheless, his survey is valuable and his counsel wise, and he is more understanding of the problem of the unmarried than most divines. Those who accept his premisses will find the book of great service, though we doubt whether it will have much influence on others.

Perhaps, like Dr. Stephen Taylor, the author of *The Battle for Health* (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.), we shall pass from the stage of irritation at Isotype Charts to a recognition of their value, but at the moment we must say we find both letterpress and illustrations much more illuminating. Tuberculosis, diphtheria, venereal disease, are given special treatment, and we are shown how the healthy body defends itself against infection. The reader will find a mass of information on many aspects of public health, and will learn how the individual can co-operate with the doctor to secure not only personal health, but a healthy community.

Mr. Ian Finlay's *Scotland*, in "The World of Today" Series (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.), will assuredly get him into trouble with his fellow-countrymen, but it is a competent piece of work. If, however, it often makes an Englishman want to argue, what will be its effect in Scotland? In 130 pages Mr. Finlay has compressed a study of Scotland's past, present, and future—economic, political, cultural; and not the least interesting of the pages are those devoted to a defence of Calvinism. The illustrations leave something to be desired: what is there distinctively Scottish about those on p. 99?

Mr. Malcolm MacDonald cannot write with the ease and charm of his father, but his well-illustrated *Canada North* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.) adds a great deal to our information about the Canadian North-West. It was an excellent idea for the High Commissioner in Canada to take, and to describe, these journeys, and we were glad to read that young men in the High Commissioner's office are acquainting themselves with life in the vast Dominion. Mr. MacDonald had riches about which to write, riches of many sorts: Dawson City then and now, the Alaskan Highway, beaver and reindeer, muskrats and seals; and he gives us an interesting narrative, with some illuminating character-sketches. Canada is destined to play a great part in the world of tomorrow, and the more people at home learn about its people and its resources, the better it will be.

Messrs. Collins had a brain-wave in bringing together in *Impressions of English Literature* (16s.) seven recently issued volumes—Sir Herbert Grierson's *The English Bible*, Lord David Cecil's *English Poets*, Mr. Graham Greene's *British Dramatists*, Mr. E. L. Woodward's *British Historians*, Miss Kate O'Brien's *English Diaries and Journals*, Miss Elizabeth Bowen's *English Novelists*, and Mr. Kenneth Matthews's *British Philosophers*. We read the volume in bed during Christmas week, and felt what an admirable Christmas present and bedside book it would make. Some slips ought to

have been caught in the reprint (*e.g.*, p. 96), and "*J.* H. Bradley" as the caption of a full-page illustration is startling.

Mr. E. E. Reynolds, the biographer of Baden-Powell, was inevitable as author of *Boy Scouts* (Collins, 4s. 6d.) in the "Britain in Pictures" series. His work is well done, and the illustrations are exceptionally fine.

Prof. Gilbert Murray has "got away with it once again". Having filled out the gaps to complete Menander's *The Rape of the Lochs* he has now turned his attention to the more difficult task of filling out the papyrus fragments of the better-known *Epitrepontes*, now published as *The Arbitration* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.). The whole reads amazingly well, and he would be a bold man who claimed to know where Menander stops and Murray begins. The debt we owe—those who cannot read Greek even more than those who can—to Prof. Murray increases with the years.

Mr. L. A. G. Strong's *Authorship* (Ross, 2s. 6d.) is a useful "Careers" book, though he seems to us to get off on the wrong foot with his diagrams and A B C's. After that, his advice is sound and practical, and amply illustrated from his own experience.

Mr. Charles Williams's *All Hallows' Eve* (Faber, 8s. 6d.) will hold the reader, though if he is imaginative he will be well advised not to begin it late at night. In London after the war we see magic at work, an evil genius set on seizing power over this world, and the world of spirits. Interwoven with the mysteries of incantations and astral bodies is seen the golden thread which tells of the might of love which gives and serves. Worthwhile but not easy reading.

Eagle Omnibus No. 2 (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.) contains six more stirring stories. Adolescents will thrill as they read of David Jones, Henry Martyn, Sam Pollard, C. E. Tyndale-Biscoe, William Jackson, and Clifford Harris. EDITOR.

Nos. 8, 9, and 10 of the "Forward Books" (Independent Press, 2s. each) are *The Church Meeting and Democracy*, by the Rev. D. T. Jenkins; *The Economic Consequences of the Church*, by the Rev. R. T. Brooks; and *Heart in Pilgrimage*, by the Rev. E. R. Micklem. The last named is a meditation on prayer, slight but sympathetic and helpful, with attention to the place in prayer of petition (" 'petitionless prayer' is strictly an abuse of words"), thanksgiving, penitence, and intercession. Difficulties are faced frankly, and a solution is often reached through insistence that all intercourse between God and the soul must be personal. Mr. Micklem's fear of subjectivism is well founded, if fashionable ("reliance on feeling in prayer . . . is a fundamental mistake"); but one misses the sense of "God's breath in man", to quote from the verse which gives the book its title, praying *in* us. Such a sense it was which led earlier Congregationalists, *e.g.*, Barrow, Cradock, Owen, to object to the read prayers which, in a chapter on "Corporate Prayer", Mr. Micklem would admit.

After an outline of the principles of "Controlled Capitalism", "Moral Socialism" (Common Wealth), and "Class Socialism" (Marxism), Mr. Brooks shows the difficulties presented by each system for the Christian worker, manager, and director. An outstanding fault of capitalism is that "it is a system in which no one is conscious of being finally responsible . . . ", and of Marxism that its doctrine of class-consciousness is anti-Christian; of Common Wealth Mr. Brooks asks, in different vein, "Dare we place this system in the hands of sinful men?" He calls our churches to become more truly Christian communities and more closely in touch with the life of society, and then to carry into effective political action such Christian judgments as are formed.

Mr. Jenkins's subject may be seen as a link between the Church at prayer and the Church in such political action. He not only reminds the reader of the large part played by the Church Meeting in the early growth of democracy, but claims that the Church Meeting is crucial today "in ensuring the very existence of democratic society". Its place in the life of the Church is also asserted to be "one of the essential ordinances which God has provided", "the extension of the Communion". Only an ordained minister, preferably in his robes, should be allowed to preside, and no one should be allowed to speak who does not attend regularly both preaching and communion service. "Spiritualisers" and "democratical heresies" Mr. Jenkins attacks with vehemence. In his references to the seventeenth century he may be accused of misunderstanding and question-begging assertions. We can only be grateful, however, for such a trenchant statement of his own position.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

I wish that the title of Dr. Emil Brunner's book, *The Divine-Human Encounter* (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.), were as significant before reading as afterwards, for then everyone would know at once that this is a book about a most important subject—the biblical conception of truth. For Dr. Brunner the subject-object relationship which lies behind knowledge in the sciences and metaphysics is here quite meaningless, for God reveals himself in personal encounter. Faith then becomes not assent to propositions, but obedience-in-trust, and all attempts to define it in terms of "objectivism" as in orthodoxy, as well as all attempts to dissolve it into "subjectivism" as in pietism, are illegitimate. It is certainly most refreshing to have a biblical understanding of truth so trenchantly distinguished from its substitutes. But we have to ask whether in fact Dr. Brunner has not made it impossible to write theology at all, in spite of his admission that some sort of doctrinal framework is necessary to apprehend the realities of revelation. And, even more fundamentally, we have to ask ourselves whether his epistemology is clearly or adequately thought out. Are "knowledge-by-encounter" and "knowledge-by-objects" really two distinct ways of knowing, or only two very different sets of conditions of knowing? If the former, how do we "know" the difference between them, or determine the truth of such knowledge? This book is a valuable beginning of a discussion that needs to go on for some time before clarity or decision can be reached.

The Divine Realm, by Dr. Evgueny Lampert (Faber, 8s. 6d.), is a searching, profound, but difficult book; though the metaphysicians will find a careful reading very rewarding. We are given a statement of the sort of philosophy that must underlie the Christian faith, especially as that has been apprehended in the Russian Orthodox Church, and in particular, with reference to the Eucharist. Dr. Lampert has powers as a thinker, and exhibits a refreshing ability to indicate the errors of St. Thomas, though we suspect that he is less acquainted with the Reformers and their descendants, though he is as outspokenly critical of them. The book begins with a philosophical section in which monism and dualism are both rejected in favour of a sacramental theistic metaphysics. It is doubtful whether the distinction of nothingness and indefiniteness in the doctrine of creation really avoids the dualism that Dr. Lampert would reject. The next section on the Divine Realm applies this sacramental understanding to the earth, the body, sex, economics and art, and gives us some rare writing and profound insights. In the third part, where the Sacrament is specifically treated, we have one of the most original and fruitful ideas of the book—a treatment of symbols as more than shells or notions alien to the thing signified, but as inclusive

living and objective realities. The Eucharist is seen as more than a theological and liturgical problem for debate, and has its proper "cosmic" setting. This is a very satisfying book, save for some carelessness in correcting proofs of Greek quotations and words—I counted no less than 35 errors!

In *The Christian Estimate of Man* (Duckworth, 6s.) Dr. Sydney Cave writes another of his amazingly successful studies of the history of Christian thought. There is no Christian *doctrine* of man, only an *estimate* which flows from doctrine. Thus the book can be largely concerned with the great themes of sin and grace, as they affect our estimate of man's nature and status. The New Testament section is suggestive in spite of brevity, and Dr. Cave finds time rightly to say that Jesus "by his friendliness to sinners opened a new chapter in men's attitude towards sin and sinners" and that a proper reading of *Romans* 9-11 gives us no right to the view that salvation and damnation depend solely on God's predestination. Dr. Cave's own views are always indicated, though that never causes him not to present the opinions of others with fairness and objectivity. Thus he can state both Augustine and Pelagius, St. Thomas and the Reformers equally well, and yet leave us in no two minds as to his own judgment. He submits that Calvin's central concern was not predestination, but the exalting of God's sovereignty. In modern times he finds himself rejecting Barth, and siding with Brunner, though with them both in a powerful criticism of contemporary humanists. One critical reflection might be made: does not the Christian estimate of man involve much more being said about what Methodists have called "sanctification" than this book suggests? Are not the Eastern theologians more aware of this than ourselves, in their conception of the theogonic nature and destiny of man? Dr. Cave *and* Dr. Lampert would write a better book together than separately!

It is interesting to have a work on Christian apologetics from the Inter-Varsity Fellowship. Canon T. C. Hammond in his *Reasoning Faith* (I.V.F., 5s.) deals with the philosophical, scientific and historical objections to Christianity, and does so very competently from a wide range of knowledge. We can only wish that the philosophical and scientific parts had been as up-to-date as the historical section, where form-criticism is dealt with, whereas in the first two sections the discussion seems to move in the regions of 25 years ago: evolutionism and Prof. Royce are sufficient indications. Nevertheless the book is still very useful as a handbook for some persistent popular misconceptions of the faith. JOHN MARSH.

Prof. Daniel Lamont's *God the Redeemer* (Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 6d.) admirably illustrates the way in which the older evangelical theology has been revitalized by Barthianism. It is emphatically the old evangelical theology which Dr. Lamont upholds: for him there is no other evangel. Christ died to save us from the wrath of God: that is the essence of the gospel. But the new interpretation appears when we are told that Christ is super-history breaking into history, and that the Cross was the decisive entry of the Eternal into our time-series.

Three chapters describe successively, Redemption as a past event, Redemption as a present experience, and Redemption as a future hope. All modernism is put down to human pride, rebelling against God. It is admitted that some who have called themselves Evangelicals have evacuated the gospel of much of its ethical and human content. But the remedy is not to depart from the Evangel, but to live it as well as preach it. it.

When allowance is made for the standpoint, the book may be said to be temperately and persuasively written; but it will hardly carry conviction

to those who are unable to identify modernism with human pride, and who do not find Barth's restatement of the old evangelicalism satisfying.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead's *A Plain Man looks at the Cross* (Independent Press, 6s.) is a book for Lenten reading, and is well adapted for that purpose; it will cause many who read it to consider again the events of Christ's death and resurrection, and their meaning for the world. But Mr. Weatherhead's aim is also theological: to clear away wrong ideas of what Christ did for us in that sacrifice of Himself, and to give an interpretation of the Atonement which can be followed by "the plain man with the modern mind". I am not sure who this plain man is, and Mr. Weatherhead does not define him, except so far as to imply that he is up-to-date and inclined to be a trifle intellectual. Perhaps the truth is that we are all plain men, and have to see things at the human level. It is this fact which gives value to this book. There is in it an exceedingly human feeling, nothing portentous or professional. To many it will be very helpful.

Mr. Weatherhead seems to place the greater part of Christ's atoning work in the time subsequent to His resurrection and ascension; in other words, in our union with the risen Christ. He says, *e.g.*, that in Gethsemane Christ "became aware that even the Cross was not the end, but in a sense the beginning of a new burden, the burden of a continued humanity, a continued ministry on the other side of death". And again, "The historic act of dying on the Cross was not the redemptive factor in our deliverance, save that it was the pledge of His age-long giving of Himself to us, the promise that He will never leave us nor forsake us". This is a side of the truth; but it seems very doubtful if the Cross can be no more than this. The place of the Cross in the Gospels, the attention it receives as obviously the climax of the divine intervention on man's behalf, and its critical place in Christian experience, all seem to place it right in the forefront of Christ's work. So do the great hymns of the Church. And as a matter of fact, Mr. Weatherhead tends to go back to older positions, once they are cleared of misconceptions: "I can sing", he says, "nearly all the Methodist Revival hymns". I wonder if it occurred to him in writing the moving Epilogue which closes the book, that the song with which the girl singer swept the Queen's Hall, "There is a green hill far away", is identical in its theology with Cowper's "There is a fountain filled with blood".

The Rev. Denis Lant's *First Steps in Prayer* (Carey Press, 5s. & 3s. 6d.) is a well-thought-out introduction to the prayer life The book does not deal with matters of controversy, but treats of the practice of prayer, both in private, in the family, and in the worship of the Church. There is much counsel which will aid the beginner in prayer; and much that all who have the conduct of worship will profit by. The chapter on the difficulties of the Interior Life is very good.

A. T. S. JAMES.

Miss Winifred E. Barnard's *Beginners' Work and Worship* (R.E.P., 3s. 6d.) is a manual for all connected with work among children between the ages of three and six. Miss Barnard's book includes an outline of the characteristics of the small child, and lays down a scheme for the organization of religious work and worship for this age. The suggestions made are based on long experience and will be of great value to all those working with Beginners. It is unfortunate that page references to the Music Section are usually wrongly given.

Our Father God, by Miss J. M. Macdougall Ferguson (R.E.P., 6d.), contains prayers for children from six to eight years old.

MARGARET PEEL.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

London Quarterly and Holborn (October, January). The October number arrived too late for our last issue, but readers should not miss Dr. A. L. Drummond's "English Nonconformity in Fiction". In January Dr. Maldwyn Edwards's "Jabez Bunting" and the Rev. H. S. Darby's "Discipline in the Devotional Life" stand out.

Baptist Quarterly (October-December). We are glad to see that Mr. Payne is giving us "Editorial Notes"; he is also responsible for an article on "Baptist Missionary Society History". It was good to read Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke's fervent tribute to John Clifford and the reprint of Dr. W. O. Carver's "Christian Unity and Church Union". The late F. Mott Harrison's "Repudiable 'Bunyan Writings' " is a necessary warning.

Hibbert Journal (January). Dr. John Murray and Dr. Jacks open with "Food for Thought", 28 challenges on the line of "Whether any have a right that others should bear their burdens". Dr. A. C. Ewing writes on "The Ethics of Punishing Germany", Dr. C. J. Cadoux on "The Punishing of Germany after . . . 1914-18", and Mr. Stephen Hobhouse on "Praying for Our Enemies", but perhaps the most important contribution is Mr. E. B. Castle's "Reconciliation in Palestine", which advocates a bi-national federal State.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (First Month). Mr. Arthur Rowntree is to assume the editorship, which has been in the hands of Mr. F. J. Gillman since Sir George Newman's retirement. An interesting number, with Myrtle Wright's "Norway under German Occupation" and Agnes Yendall's "Christianity and Quakerism" specially useful.

Modern Churchman (December). The fact that this ably-edited journal is able to renew exchanges is, we trust, another indication that the strain of war is lessening and its end nearer. The Editor and Bishop Henson write of William Temple, and Canon Major is also responsible for an account of "Joe" Legge, "The Public House Parson". The Rev. T. Wigley discusses "What is Man?", and Dr. C. J. Wright states his reasons for entering the Church of England in a statement which is more sentimental than convincing.

Expository Times (December-February). Prof. C. E. Raven has an estimate of Archbishop Temple, Dr. H. G. Wood discusses "Religion and Ethics". Dr. Garvie, Dr. Geo. Ogg and Prof. N. H. Snaith contribute among others.

Evangelical Quarterly (January). Dr. S. M. Zwemer follows Burgon in claiming the last 12 verses of *Mark* are part of the Gospel. The Rev. S. Leigh Hunt defends Wycliffe. Dr. William Manson asks, "Is a Synthesis of Presbyterianism and Episcopacy Possible?"

Church Quarterly (January-March). Mr. Charles King's "Outlines of *N.T.* Chronology" fixes the birth of Jesus *c.* 15 B.C. and the Crucifixion in A.D. 27, the Conversion of Paul in 29 and his death in 64. Mr. Graham Seton Hutchinson writes on General Gordon, and Dr. C. Sydney Carter on Richard Hooker.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (December). Two biblical articles are Prof. E. Robertson's "O.T. Stories: Their Purpose and Their Art" and Prof. T. W. Manson's "The Life of Jesus: (3) The Work of St. Luke". Prof. T. H. Pear discusses interestingly "The Concept of Mental Maturity". There are several contributions on the medieval period, which has a disproportionate share of the number. Prof. Chaney gives us a glimpse of Villon's Paris.

Yale Review (Autumn). A valuable and varied number, with informing contributions on the Philippines, France, and Japan. Mr. Robert Fontaine's story, "The Life and Death of Uncle Louis", is a delight, and Mr. Paul Horgan's sketches, "Taos Valley", are specially well done. (Winter). Mr. Geoffrey Crowther's "British Twentieth-Century Economics" is as important and timely as his *Economist* article which caused such a stir in N. America. At the other extreme is Miss Leonora Herrick's "Employment and Post-War Prosperity", from which the reader would gather there is only one country in the world. Mr. J. G. Randall's "Lincoln and John Bright" is interesting, and "Note on the Home Front" shows how war conditions of the milder sort are influencing the Western seaboard.

International Review of Missions (January). Most of the issue is taken up with the indispensable Annual Survey, for which Miss Sinclair has been largely responsible. A searching article is the Rev. J. E. L. Newbegin's "The Ordained Foreign Missionary in the Indian Church". Dr. Visser 't Hooft discusses "The Reconstruction of the Churches in Europe".

World Dominion (January-February). Mrs. Chaney writes on "Inside Burma", Dr. A. M. Chirgwin on "After the War", Capt. L. D. Gammans on "Do We Need a Colonial Charter?", and the Rev. A. McLeish on "Problem of Europe". (March-April). Judge P. Chenchiah writes on "Asramas and the New World Order" and the Rev. F. Balchin on "What the Chinese are Talking About". Mr. Joachim Fischer gives an appalling account of Nazi tortures.

Religion and Life (Autumn). Dr. H. S. Leiper on "The World Council of Churches and the War Emergency", Dr. Paul Ramsey on "A Social Policy for Liberal Religion", President H. S. Coffin on "The Kingdom of God Presses In", and Dr. W. W. Rockwell on "Theological Libraries in the United States" are but four of a dozen interesting articles. (Winter). A dozen interesting articles, of which the most interesting to English readers will be Dr. E. F. Scott's "James Moffatt" and the Rev. C. Northcott's "Educating the New England". Prof. C. F. Braden's "Can We Learn from Other Cults?" is practical, and so is Chaplain C. A. Pennington's "The Church and Returning Veterans". Dr. R. W. Sockman deals with some recent novels.

Harvard Theological Review (July). The *pièce de resistance* is Dr. H. I. Bell's "Evidences of Christianity in Egypt during the Roman Period", in which he argues that in the 2nd century the number of Christians was by no means negligible and by the middle of the third considerable. Mr. H. C. Youtie writes on "Sampathis". (October). 60 pp. are given to Mr. Arthur Jeffery's "Ghevond's Text of the Correspondence between 'Umar II and Leo III". Mr. N. P. Jacobson discusses Niebuhr's Philosophy of History, and Mr. J. W. Swain's "Gamaliel's Speech and Caligula's Statue".

Review and Expositor (October). Dr. J. M. Dawson cogently restates the principles of religious liberty, contrasting them with "toleration". Mr. F. W. Clonts writes on Thomas Helwys, and Dr. G. S. Dobbins's estimate of the task of evangelism, under the title "Achieving a Great Goal and Avoiding a Grave Danger", is pertinent, as is all he writes.

The Review of Religion (November). 70 pp. of reviews, preceded by "Communications" (one on Bergson's relation to the Catholic Church) and Prof. Tillich's Presidential Address to the American Theological Society, "Estrangement and Reconciliation in Modern Thought".

Anglican Theological Review (October). Articles on Bishop Brent, Ralph Cudworth, and "Philosophy through Exegesis" are well worth reading. Part VI of "The Anglican Tradition" is on "The Tradition and Mission of the Church".

Review of Religion (January). This journal benefits by the co-operation of Jews in its management, and Mr. Abraham Heschel's article on "Prayer" is one from which Christians could learn much. Other articles are Mr. Q. Breen's "The Two-Fold Truth Theory in Melancthon" and Mr. T. H. Proctor's "J. B. Pratt's Philosophy of Religion". 50 pp. of reviews.

CORRESPONDENCE

DATE, PLEASE!

SIR,—"In this age more than in any other, it is necessary to simplify religion and to free it from all accessories. It will then be approved of by the philosophers and within reach of the people, which can neither remember nor discuss the mass of articles of which it has been composed, the greater part of which are meaningless to them".

Rabaut, Huguenot pastor, c. 1760.
Quoted in A. J. Grant, *The Huguenots*, 232.

As Professor Grant remarks: "Remarkable words to come from a Calvinist preacher".

Yours,

L. MAURICE WILLIAMS.